MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA REVIEW

2 JULY 1981

Lebanese Crisis

Begin Denies Missile Withdrawal--According to Jerusalem radio, Israeli Prime Minister Menahem Begin has denied a report by Voice of Lebanon radio that the Syrians have removed SAM missiles from the Al-Biqa' valley. The radio also quoted Syrian Ba'th Party Assistant Secretary General 'Abdallah al-Ahmar as telling reporters in Prague that Syria will not remove the SAM missiles from Al-Biqa' because it has the legitimate right to deploy them there to defend its soldiers in the Arab Deterrent Force (ADF).

Security situation--The Voice of Lebanon reported renewed fighting in Beirut with ADF and Palestinian units shelling Christian positions in the eastern sector. The radio spoke of indiscriminate shelling of Al-Laqluq, north of the capital. The Voice of Lebanon also accused the ADF of refusing to withdraw from its positions around the city of Zahlah. It claimed that the Phalangists have carried out their part of the agreement by withdrawing, but that the Syrians have failed to carry out the other part. In remarks broadcast by Beirut radio after a meeting in Damascus with Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad, Zahlah government Minister Joseph abu-Khatir said he and his two colleagues from Zahlah are certain that the Syrians are working to prevent any further disruptions between the ADF and Lebanese forces.

Jerusalem radio reported that during the evening ADF artillery at Rayhan joined with Palestinian guns at Beaufort Castle in shelling heavily the Christian border enclave villages of Marj 'Uyun and Al-Qualayah. The radio described the incident as one of the gravest to occur in southern Lebanon recently, pointing out that the Syrians have refrained from committing their artillery against Maj Sa'd Haddad's militia for almost a year.

Israeli Elections

Talks on Coalition--According to Jerusalem radio, National Religious Party leader Yosef Burg told reporters after a meeting with Prime Minister Begin that he and Begin had held an initial discussion on the government that should be formed but that they did not discuss any details. He indicated that he will also be meeting with Labor Party Chairman Shim'on Peres. The radio reported that Begin will confer with the leaders of Agudat Yisra'el on 2 July to try to determine if they will continue to be partners in the coalition. It cited a senior Likud source as saying that Begin will be able to form a government supported by 63 or 64 Knesset members.

Arab Reaction--Jerusalem radio reported that in an inteview with its correspondent in Cairo, Egyptian Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Butrus Ghali said the weakness of the coalition that will be formed in Israel might constitute an obstacle to the continuation of the peace process, but he refused to express a preference for an Israeli government led by Peres. In an interview with the U.S. television networks, cited by Amman radio, Jordan's King Husayn said there is no major difference of opinion between Israeli Prime Minister Begin and Labor Party Chairman Shim'on Peres on the basic issues, such as the status of Jerusalem and Palestinian rights. According to KUNA, the Kuwaiti newspaper AL-QABAS described the difference between Begin and Peres as one of form and not of essence. It asserted that while Peres calls on the Arabs to come to the negotiating table so that he can impose Israeli conditions on them, Begin asks the Arabs to kneel at the negotiating table so that he can dictate the same terms.

Iran

Rafsanjani Majlis Speech--In an address to the Majlis broadcast by Tehran radio, speaker 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani said the 28 June bombing of the Islamic Republican Party

(IRP) headquarters failed in its aims of bringing the administration of the country to a halt and of causing a general crisis throughout Iran. He said the nation has been alerted by the massacre and is ready to replace its martyrs with new heroes. Rafsanjani claimed that the bombing was a desperate measure undertaken by the government's enemies after the hopes they had pinned on Abolhasan Bani-Sadr were dashed by his dismissal from the presidency and the leadership of the armed forces. The fugitive former president is now a captive and pawn of the Mojahedin-e Khalq, Rafsanjani added. He jointly plots with them but is a "political corpse" in their hands. Warning youthful opponents of the government that one day the nation's patience with them will be exhausted, Rafsanjani urged them to stop their campaign of sabotage.

Khomeyni Speech--Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeyni told clergymen at Hoseyniyeh Jamaran that Iran lost valuable politicians in the 28 June bombing. In his speech, a recording of which was broadcast by Tehran radio, he also charged that the Western media has misquoted him as saying the 28 June bombing was a domestic issue and that the United States was not involved. Khomeyni stressed that in his view the United States was involved since it supports opponents of the government. He cautioned people against not voting in the forthcoming presidential election, asserting that voting is a "divine duty" and that the nation should elect an individual known for his commitment to Islam. Khomeyni also said clergymen should remain on the political scene and should turn their mosques into fortresses for Islam.

Presidential Election Registration--In a statement broadcast by Tehran radio, the interior minister announced that all candidates in Iran's presidential election, due to be held on 24 July, must register their candidacy at the Interior Ministry building between 4 and 6 July.

FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Middle East and Africa

Vol V No 127 *2 July 1981*

MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA REVIEW i

INTER-ARAB AFFAIRS

VOP Warns Arabs Who Supported Ma'arakh List A 1

ARABIAN PENINSULA

OMAN

Muscat Attacks Soviet Military Presence in Gulf C 1

SAUDI ARABIA

Defense Minister Says AWACS Do Not Serve Israel C 2

EGYPT

Officials View Israeli Election, Peace Efforts D 1
Ghali Cited D 1
Al-Baz Comments D 1
Commentary on Israeli Election's Impact on Peace D 1
Egypt Has Reservations on OAU Tripoli Meeting D 2
Interior Minister Speaks on Sectarian Incidents D 2
President As-Sadat Interviewed by AL-AHRAM D 3
MAY Interviews As-Sadat on Contacts With Arabs D 13

IRAQ

Baghdad Carries ABC Interview With Saddam Husayn E 1
Saddam Husayn Interviewed by Brazilian Television E 9
Armed Forces General Command Communique 385 E 11
Kurdish Statement on Theft of Barzani's Remains [Voice of Iraqi Kurdistan] E 12
Kurdish Radio Mourns Assassination of Leader [Voice of Iraqi Kurdistan] E 13

JORDAN

King Interviewed by U.S. Television Networks F 1
Further Report F 2

LEBANON

Butrus Answers Questions Before Damascus Visit G 1
Syrians Reportedly Refuse To Withdraw From Zahlah G 1
Cabinet Meets; Sarkis Satisfied With Zahlah Plan G 2
Al-Wazzan Comments G 2
Communist Leader Sees No Solution 'in Offing' [AS-SAFIR 28 Jun] G 2

SYRIA

Al-Asad, Khaddam Receive Zahlah Ministers H 1
Zahlah Minister Comments H 1
GDR's Guenther Kleiber Leaves Damascus 1 Jul H 1

ISRAEL

Begin Expected To Form 'Stronger' Government I 1
Begin, Burg Meet 1 Jul on Forming Coalition I 1
Begin Reiterates Support for Habib Mission I 2
No Major Diplomatic Moves Seen Until September [POST 2 Jul] I 2
Begin Denies Syria Moved Missiles From Lebanon I 3
Jordan Said Willing To Allow Communist Activity I 3

NORTH AFRICA

LIBYA

Statement on UAE Leader's 1 Jul Visit to Tripoli Q 1
U.S. State Department Position on OAU Condemned Q 2

MOROCCO

Boucetta Interviewed on Relations With Mauritania Q 2
Missile-Equipped Patrol Boats Bought From Spain Q 3

SUDAN

New York TIMES Interview of Numayri Cited Q 3

EAST AFRICA

ETHIOPIA

Defense Minister Receives USSR's Sokolov R 1
Ethiopian-Cuban Cooperation Commission Meets R 1
Official Says Amnesty for Eritrean Rebels Stands R 1

SOMALIA

Siad Barre Addresses Nation on Independence Day R 2

CENTRAL AFRICA

BURUNDI

President Bagaza Explains Draft Constitution S 1

EQUATORIAL GUINEA

President's Warning to Military Reported S 1

ZAIRE

Reports, Comment on Belgium Relations Issue S 1
Mobutu Meeting With Envoy S 1
Minister's Visit Canceled S 1
AZAP Comment S 2
Karl-I-Bond Says Mobutu Ordered Shaba Shootings S 3

WEST AFRICA

GUINEA-BISSAU

Large Phosphate Deposits Discovered in North T 1

MALI

External Relations Secretary Meets CPSU Delegation T 1
Supreme Soviet Message Denounces Threat of War T 1

NIGERIA

Communique Signed on Botswana President's Visit T 1
TIMES Respects Choice of Tripoli as Next OAU Venue T 2

SENEGAL

National Assembly Adopts Law Against Corruption T 2

SOUTHERN AFRICA

MOZAMBIQUE

Diplomatic Relations With Malawi Established U 1

NAMIBIA

Mudge Notes Need for National Assembly Autonomy U 1

VOP WARNS ARABS WHO SUPPORTED MA'ARAKH LIST

JN012111 (Clandestine) Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1800 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Since the first moments of vote counting in the 10th Knesset elections, it has been clear that there is media pressure in the direction of the so-called relative Arab support for the Ma'arakh list. This media pressure centers on an old objective: establishing a state of blind confidence between the Arabs, or at least some of them, and the Ma'arakh leaders under the pretext that the Ma'arakh, if it assumes power now or after several years, will reward those Arabs who voted for it.

While we understand the large-scale campaign Ma'arakh has carried on in Arab circles, in which it has used many weapons, such as scaring some with the possibility of the return of Begin, bribing others with checks and color television sets and distributing promises which will vanish immediately after the elections, we say that while we understand this large-scale campaign, which resembles a real war against the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality, which is very popular among the Arabs, we submit the following remarks:

1. There is no doubt that the large-scale information campaign on so-called Arab support for Ma'arakh is largely exaggerated and is based on false assumptions. It is true that any transient Arab support will be exploited by the Zionist usurpers and racists. We, however, have to distinguish between transient factors and what they are trying to depict as being a deep-rooted manifestation. Some of the Arabs who have voted for the Ma'arakh because of the danger of Begin's return will discover that they have been deceived twice: The first is that if Begin does not return they will easily discover the fact that the Ma'arakh is worse than the Likud. In case of Begin's return, they will discover that they have done nothing worth mentioning except punish RAKAH, which is closest to them and has paid some of the price for this erroneous assessment.

Those who have given their votes to Ma'arakh as a result of the promises will pass through an experience which will not be complicated. They will discover that election campaigns are one thing and assuming power is something else. Promises made during elections cannot be counted on. When a party is in power, it has to account for its actions in accordance with its political program, in which there is no need for the Arabs. As for those who have given their votes as a result of being lured by checks and color television sets, we have nothing to tell them except that a long struggle will be imposed on them by the Zionist side, which is not allowed by its structure and role to be anything but hostile to the Arabs, even those who have been deceived or those who collaborate.

We do not regret the results and we consider the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality, which has lost one of its seats, to be a militant and stubborn party which may win or lose. This is not the only militant guage by which the front measures its activities. It has to fight Zionism. It will continue its struggle and will not remain inactive. Yes, we are confident that it will struggle and increase its efforts in Arab and even Jewish circles to expose the Ma'arakh deception. It will continue its democratic struggle to liquidate backward and racist Zionism. It will continue its support for the PLO and for the Palestinian people's national rights. It will celebrate the day of the land every 30 March. It will hold popular conferences. Its fate since its beginning has been to struggle and never become a peddler of votes or bribes.

OMAN

MUSCAT ATTACKS SOVIET MILITARY PRESENCE IN GULF

EA012101 Muscat Domestic Service in Arabic 1315 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Commentary from the "We and the World" program]

[Text] Mr Abdallah Ya'qub Bishara, secretary general of the Gulf Cooperation Council, has stated that the economic progress of the member states of the council cannot be separated from political stability, which depends on two elements: internal and external security. Therefore the security issue is fundamental. The resolutions so far issued by the Cooperation Council have reflected the member-states' conviction that this issue is important, particularly in view of the mounting Soviet presence in South Yemen and its expansionist ambitions, which are no longer a secret to anybody. Otherwise, what secret lies behind this daily increasing presence? And for whom or against whom are the enormous quantities of Soviet arms and the thousands of experts from the other bloc states intended?

Naturally, the Aden rulers cannot deceive the world that all this is for security and defense needs; it simply exceeds all the requirements of a small state like South Yemen, besides the fact that there is no threat or even a hint of a threat to necessitate the buildup.

Reports confirm that Aden harbor has become a key Soviet base and a passage for their fleets into the Indian Ocean. South Yemen's airports have become bases for advanced Soviet aircraft. The reality of Soviet activity on Socotra Island in building a Soviet naval base, in addition to another currently being built in Aden harbor, is no longer a secret. Everyone knows how the inhabitants of the island were forcibly evacuated at the orders of the Soviets to make room for the implementation of their expansionist designs.

Reports also say that the Soviets are currently supervising the construction of long-range rocket launching platforms at (Al-Hazz) and (Al-Hulayzan) on the border with North Yemen, in addition to building a new air base in Lahij Province.

What also is the secret behind the intimacy we see today between the Aden regime and the regime of Mengistu Haile Mariam in Ethiopia? Both of them are in Moscow's orbit. And what is the secret behind the joint training programs being carried out by Cuban experts for the forces of the two regimes, and against whom is it directed?

In addition to all this, whoever follows the statements of the Aden rulers on the situation in the Gulf comes out with the firm conviction that South Yemen has become a center of disquiet, tension and terrorism, that it is well-versed in implementing Moscow's expansionist designs in the area and is colluding with all the other agent regimes in Cuba, Ethiopia and Vietnam to this end.

Why do we go so far? Is the Aden regime's aggression against the sultanate twice in one month not sufficient proof of its deep-rooted aggressive tendency and its obedience to Moscow's orders? It would not have dared to carry out the aggression had it not been for the protection and backing of Moscow.

After this is there any remaining doubt that the Aden regime has become a mere tool in the hands of Moscow for spreading disquiet in the area in order to divert attention from what is important and useful and to dissipate energies in what is useless instead of directing them towards cooperation and integration for what is good and for a better future? In light of what we have explained, can there be any opinion other than the one seeing security as the most important and pressing issue of all?

His Excellency (Hafiz) Salim al-Ghassani, press adviser to his majesty the sultan, has confirmed this by saying: Security is a pressing necessity and tops the list of aims on which the Gulf Cooperation Council was based. Anything else takes second place. Thanks to its experience, Oman has realized this danger and resisted it. Oman lived for a while building with one hand and fighting with the other. The states of the area know well the truth of Oman's heroic stand and its role in curbing the recalcitrance of the treacherous communist onslaught.

Despite this lesson which Oman taught the communists, they nevertheless still lie in wait in Aden. The leaders of the states of the area know better than others what is going on today in Aden. They realize better than others that the communist incursions, proudly routed by Oman in the mountains of Dhufar, can be repeated in any other area so long as Soviet ambitions exist. Their attempts to topple legal regimes and place them with agent regimes continue. They do not distinguish one state from another. They use the Aden regime as a tool and a means, exploiting their aggressive attitude to all and sundry. The proof of this is what we see today, namely the Soviet construction of long-range rocket platforms at (Al-Hazz) and (Al-Hulayzan) on the border with North Yemen, so that San'a' is at Aden's mercy.

This is happening despite what Aden continually says about good relations between the two countries, and despite the fact that San'a' has never threatened or harmed Yemen. Therefore, can there be two opinions, in view of these clearly aggressive intentions, on the importance of security as the prop of political stability and economic progress? With security all the worthwhile goals of the states and peoples in the area will be achieved. With its protection this area will get through this delicate stage as it moves along the right path toward vast horizons of cooperation, integration and cohesion for good.

SAUDI ARABIA

DEFENSE MINISTER SAYS AWACS DO NOT SERVE ISRAEL

LD011438 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 1335 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] At-Ta'if, 1 Jul (SPA)--Minister of Defense and Aviation Prince Sultan ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, has affirmed that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia would not hesitate to attend any meeting agreed upon by our Arab brothers even if it were to be held before the Arab summit conference which is scheduled for November. Prince Sultan spoke at a press conference he held following the graduation ceremony at the military signals school in At-Ta'if today.

Prince Sultan also said that through good will and quiet work, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has succeeded in achieving a reconcilation between Morocco and Mauritania. He added that King Khalid ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz has made a strong and effective contribution toward ending the Sahara problem by peaceful means as King Hassan II, the Moroccan monarch wished.

Replying to a question concerning reconciliation between Syria and Iraq, Prince Sultan said that Saudi efforts have never stopped in this regard. Prince Sultan said that he did not believe, anyway, that there was any quarrel between the two countries and that each one of them has declared its readiness to bolster its sister against any aggression by the treacherous enemy.

Responding to a question about rumors that the United States only supplied AWACS to the kingdom to serve Israeli interests, Prince Sultan said that that was a wrong thing to say, because neither the United States nor anybody else can ask the kingdom to do something to serve the interests of the Israeli enemy. He affirmed that such rumors should be cast away by words, deeds, religion and ethics. Furthermore, the United States would never ask such a thing of Saudi Arabia because it knows in advance that this would not be acceptable.

OFFICIALS VIEW ISRAELI ELECTION, PEACE EFFORTS

Ghali Cited

NC020907 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 0710 GMT 2 Jul 81

[From the press review]

[Text] AL-AHRAM reports Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Dr Butrus Ghali as saying that we are following up the results of the elections in Israel and that all that concerns us is the formation of a strong government capable of continuing negotiations and implementing the provisions of the peace treaties and other agreements. At the same time, a weak government that cannot rise to the level of responsibility will be an impediment in the way of peace.

Al-Baz Comments

NC011355 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1233 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Foreign Ministry First Under Secretary Dr Usamah al-Baz has commented on the results of the Israeli elections. He said that the position of the Arab Republic of Egypt is unchanged. Egypt, he said, considers that victory for Likud or the Labor Party will not much affect the continuation of the Egyptian policy, which is to go ahead with the peace measures and make Israel face its responsibilities regarding the Palestinian people's rights.

He added that Egyptian and Arab pressure must continue until Israel realizes that it has only one choice, namely, acknowledging the Palestinian people's rights and honoring all its commitments.

Dr Usamah al-Baz also said that there is no difference between the Likud bloc and the Labor bloc. The only difference is that Likud signed the peace treaty and its appendices with us, which is considered a reason for the continued implementation of all that was signed.

Dr Usamah al-Baz said that agreement has been reached on 95 percent of the agreement for formation of the multinational force and that contacts are underway on the technical points of the agreement so that the three sides can sign it in London this July. He concluded that the signing of the agreement, scheduled for 5 July, may be delayed a few days to enable all points of disagreement to be resolved.

COMMENTARY ON ISRAELI ELECTION'S IMPACT ON PEACE

NC011504 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1233 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Usamah 'Abd al-Ghani commentary: "Comprehensive Peace Must Be the First Concern of the Next Israeli Government"]

[Text] To us there are no apparent real differences between one Israeli Government and another. We believe that Israeli foreign policy would be the same under Likud rule and Labor rule. A possible difference is the implementation of this policy.

Above all, what concerns us is that the next Israeli Government should be better capable of dealing with the problems of establishing peace in the Middle East and should have enough political ability and vision to tackle these problems. Naturally, the strategy of our work for peace in the Middle East is based on the principles that the Palestine question is the core of the problem and that there can be no comprehensive peace unless the question is settled in a manner which takes the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people into consideration.

Under the Camp David agreements, the Likud coalition government made certain commitments. Honoring these commitments would ensure steady progress toward a settlement of the Palestine problem.

They include a commitment to withdraw the Israeli occupation forces from the West Bank and Gaza Strip, to withdraw the Israeli military government and the civilian administration from the occupied Palestinian territory and to set up a Palestinian national authority which will be in charge of full autonomy within the framework of transitional, specific and temporary measures, enabling the way to be paved for the Palestinian people to exercise their legitimate and inalienable rights.

The Israeli Government, which affirmed these commitments at Camp David, has up to the last moment been taking measures that completely contradict these commitments. Egypt has condemned those Israeli measures as being in conflict with building up trust with the Palestinians or opening the door to other parties to encourage them to catch up with the peace process.

We believe that the quality of the next Israeli Government will be judged on the basis of its ability to prove its true intentions toward the concept of comprehensive and just peace and continue implementation of all that was undertaken under the peace agreements. We also believe that if economic problems and the Israeli Government's inability to control these problems are the cause of the Israeli Government's political problems, we say that the continual wars and their heavy consequences were the prime cause for Israel's economic difficulties, as well as those of other confrontation countries. There is no doubt that the establishment of a comprehensive peace in the region is the only guarantee for their economic and political stability.

Egypt has chosen the course of peace--with all its heavy burdens--as its destiny and it will not go back on its destiny or decision. Egypt will continue to work side by side with all the peace-loving forces in order to establish a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Any new Israeli Government must take into consideration that the security of Israel and its people, just like the security of any other state and people in the region, can only be established through sincere and conscientious efforts to boost the peace process and ward off the dangers threatening it.

EGYPT HAS RESERVATIONS ON OAU TRIPOLI MEETING

NC021057 Cairo MENA in Arabic 0715 GMT 2 Jul 81

[Text] Cairo, 2 Jul (MENA)--AL-AHRAM today reports that Egypt has sent a note to the OAU secretary general expressing reservations concerning the resolution adopted in Nairobi to hold the next African summit in Tripoli, Libya. AL-AHRAM adds that on Monday, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Dr Butrus Ghali will summon all African ambassadors in Cairo to discuss, analyze and study the outcome of the African summit meetings.

INTERIOR MINISTER SPEAKS ON SECTARIAN INCIDENTS

NC012208 Cairo MENA in English 1930 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Cairo, 1 Jul (MENA)--Minister of Interior Nabawi Isma'il confirmed today that Moslems and Christians alike denounced what had recently taken place in Az-Zawiyah al-Hamra', a Cairo suburb. The minister paid tribute to the national unity among [words indistinct] that Egypt was and still is the rock on which all attempts to jeopardise national unity had been hit.

Addressing a rally on the occasion of the opening of a new police station at the district, the minister said the world at large appreciates the security, safety, freedom and democracy that [passage indistinct]. The minister pointed out that the deplorable sectarian incidents started with an ordinary quarrel then escalated due to the agitation by irresponsible elements whose aim was to lead events out of its ordinary shape.

The minister also pointed out that Egypt's enemies abroad and within tried to exploit those incidents to leap on our national march and to sow dissention among our ranks. He addressed thanks to political, popular and executive organs for the positive and constructive role they played.

Following the rally the residents of Az-Zawiyah al-Hamra' sent a cable to President Anwar as-Sadat in which they pledged to stand as one rank behind him.

PRESIDENT AS-SADAT INTERVIEWED BY AL-AHRAM

NC261252 Cairo MENA in Arabic 0735 GMT 26 Jun 81

[Excerpts] Cairo, 26 Jun (MENA)--President as-Sadat has stated that if we are to return to harmony with the Arabs, each of us must respect the will of the others. He emphasized that any Arab initiative requires above all that the Arab leaders agree on a minimum of what they want. The following is the text of the interview that President as-Sadat granted to AL-AHRAM:

Question: After 4 years of the peace initiative and the resulting Arab conditions, many insistently ask: How long can the present situation continue between Egypt and the Arab states? It is true that the Arabs have not taken one step forward during this period to say what they can do, but don't you believe that it is the responsibility of Egypt, which took the initiative toward Israel, to embark on an Arab initiative to try to reconfirm its commitments and responsibilities toward the Arab nation?

Answer: This is a question that is frequently asked. The question is that Egypt has taken the initiative toward Israel, so why not do the same with the Arabs? I am not responsible for the present situation. I went to Syria 48 hours before I went to Israel. I sat down and talked with Al-Asad at his house for 5 and 1/2 hours after dinner. I told him: I am going, Hafiz, to Jerusalem in 48 hours, and I have come to tell you that the Golan and Sinai will no longer be a problem after the start of this peace process. The only problem will be the West Bank, which is the Palestinian question. Do you have any doubts that I will not bargain with the Arab territories? He said no. I said: Well, I can see that you do not approve of my tour. Well, let us declare at the press conference, which we will hold in Damascus before I leave the airport tomorrow morning, that we do not differ on the strategy, but on the tactics. You do not approve of this step and you are free, but I tell you that the Golan and Sinai will no longer be a problem after I go to Jerusalem the day after tomorrow. The problem will be the West Bank and Gaza, and they constitute the Palestinian question.

Had Hafiz al-Asad agreed with me, he would get the Golan Heights back before I get back Sinai, because the Golan problem is very easy. The depth there is 26 kilometers, compared to the depth that I have here. I have a depth of 200 kilometers. The distance from Port Said to Suez, which was under Israeli occupation, is 180 kilometers. The depth to the Suez Canal is 180 kilometers and the entire depth I have is 200 kilometers, where as the depth he has is only 26 kilometers. [all figures as received] This is really not a problem.

I actually began my initiative with Syria. I say that the minimum required for discussing these matters does not, regrettably, exist--not as far as Al-Asad alone is concerned, nor as far as the group of Arab leaders is concerned. This might be because of a lack of understanding or (?resort to maneuvering) or because of domestic conditions, an inability owing to inherited slogans or grudges against Egypt. This is, regrettably, the case.

If the minimum required is not available, then to whom shall I talk? Well, I went to Israel, where not only the minimum required was available, but--I would like to say that there was full readiness, despite the fact that I had created an earthquake, or what they described as an earthquake, during the October war. There was full readiness on the part of the ruler, Begin. I had asked Ceasusescu about him, and he told me: He is strong and he wants peace. The readiness of the Israeli people, who welcomed me in Jerusalem, dazzled me. This is despite the fact that there were many victims of the October war.

However, the standard required to grasp the evolution of history exists. This grasp of the evolution of history does not, regrettably, exist in the Arab world, where there are inherited slogans, weaknesses and fears from the domestic front, Palestinians, Iraqis and Syrians. The Arab rulers are afraid of each other. What could Egypt do? I actually heard many say: Why not go to the Arabs and settle everything? Well, I need a minimum level of understanding to hold discussions because otherwise it would be impossible to do anything. Had I adopted their methods, Israel would have still been on the eastern bank [of the canal] and I would be uttering slogans.

Question: Then how would it be possible for the Arab nation to get out of the whirlpool in which Your Excellency finds yourself? When you go anywhere you do not waste time telling them: We shall forget the differences and everything. This has actually taken place in Khartoum, Morocco and Algeria.

Answer: Ah, I am always saying let us all reach one word and let rationality prevail. I have always said the following: I mean, the subject is not a profound puzzle. Come and let us look at the ten European states operating in the European Community. Each of these states has its own language, nationality and religion. After reaching maturity, these states realized that it was shameful for one to impose its will on another. This is not found here. Look at their line of behavior. They sent me a threat with a messenger, the Lebanese prime minister, from Baghdad, saying that the conference is convening in Baghdad and either you come or we shall meet without you. Why this? Why impose a will on Egypt--Egypt, where 99.9 percent of its people support peace. The least those people in Baghdad could have done was to respect the will of this country and not attempt to impose their will on it. However, what does this show? It shows their weaknesses as well as their attempts to control, to impose their will and to ignore an entire people that constitute half of the Arab nation. We remain the same. The forty million of us alone form half the Arab nation. Well, how then can there be an understanding with such a mentality?

What happened was that I said sorry. Well if I had (?listened) to you, the $5 billion and I know them very well. [sentence as received] During the October war Iraq officially announced that it would not participate in the oil embargo and sold its oil. This was a daring action by Iraq. But bargaining Libya, which was riding the wave in Baghdad, was selling oil to the United States through Italy. During the whole time, the Iraqis were the bravest because they officially announced that they would not abide by the embargo and officially and publicly (?kept) their 3.5 million barrels daily, while Libya openly sold its oil to the United States through Italy. I would like to ask: What right was there for this haughtiness and this way of doing things, which no one accepts in dealings between himself and other people. These basic matters are not understood. Why?

It is because of this that I say that the first necessity is for one to respect the will of others. When they knew that 99.9 percent of the Egyptian people support peace, it was futile to send me a threat through a messenger and to adopt the resolutions that were adopted in Baghdad.

When I asked why such a thing was done in the rooms, I was told: We were afraid of Saddam Husayn because it would reach the bedrooms. This actually happened when a ruling Gulf family was surprised one day with the revelation that all its members and their oil wealth were known. Are their fears an appropriate line of procedure? It is impossible. No people other than us have the potentials of one history, language and religion. Look at the European community: It operates with ten languages. There is also the European Common Market and the European Parliament, which I have addressed.

I say here that the maxim on which I always work is (?the truth). This is found in Israel but it is not found among the Arabs. No one is upset by the truth. Why? Because before I went to address their parliament the Israelis were a prepared and open-minded people and knew what I was going to say and what reason was going to say. They were prepared to listen if they found that the person who was in front of them was truthful and sincere in his words. What actually happened was that they found me truthful and sincere. The matter was settled and the Israeli Knesset adopted resolutions concerning Sinai that it otherwise would never have adopted.

You ask me who the most enthusiastic in Baghdad were. They were Saddam Husayn, Libya, Syria and the Palestinians. They are the convulsive persons. Saddam approached me after 3 years and he wanted to buy arms. He is the most fanatic. Al-Qadhdhafi sent me his cousin last Christmas and I met with him 16 months ago, as well as 3 months ago in February. [dates as received] I say that what is regrettable is that they have not read the Camp David agreements. They opposed them before reading them. Why did the most narrow-minded Arabs, like Saddam Husayn, continue to do so?

Al-Qadhdhafi sent a message telling me that he wanted to conclude a secret agreement with us. He said: Let us secretly eliminate all the dangerous things that happened in Baghdad and reopen our borders. I only told him: My son, you have taught us something. You have taught that you do not respect what you do in the open. How, then, would you respect what is done in secret? Furthermore, why should I conclude a secret agreement with you and why not announce it? I am with my people and I do not hide anything from them. I cannot hide anything from them: This is the source of my strength. These were the facts that I told him. I told him: I am sorry, there can be no secret agreement. Well, the question, my son, is: What is your opinion on the Camp David agreement? He said: We agree to the first part of the Camp David agreement related to the Egyptian-Israeli treaty and the return of Sinai. We do not approve of the second part related to the autonomy. I said: Well, what is your objection to it, my son? He answered: This is an issue that concerns all of us as Arabs, and not Egypt alone. Egypt has assumed the responsibility for it alone and we do not approve this. I told him: Did you read the Camp David agreement? Had you read the Camp David agreement, you wouldn't have said this. I have not entered as a party to the agreement to assume responsibility instead of the Palestinians but to end the Israeli occupation and turn the eternal occupation into a 5-year interim period.

Isn't it written in the Camp David agreement that the Israeli military government and the Israeli civilian government will fall the day that the results of the autonomy elections become known, and that the Palestinians will rule themselves? There will be 5 years of full autonomy that will replace the eternal occupation, the end of which cannot now be seen. Israel would withdraw to certain security points and the Palestinians would rule themselves. I told him: Were you to trouble yourselves and read the agreements, you would have realized, my son, that I have not assumed responsibility for the Palestinian question. On the contrary, I have stated in my parliament and declared to the entire world, and I declare each day, that during the two meetings Carter, Begin and I held in Camp David I told Carter and Begin: Neither you, Carter, nor the United States and neither you, Begin, nor Israel and neither I nor Egypt have the right to speak of or discuss the Palestinian question. The Palestinians are the ones entitled to do so.

All I am doing in the Camp David agreements--and you would find out it is true if you were to read them--is ending the Israeli occupation. Instead of an endless occupation, we are limiting it to 5 years, which we will fix in an agreement after the Palestinians determine their future. They have the right to veto it.

The Arab rulers did not read the Camp David agreement, nor do they want to read it. They are being carried by the current. It is haughtiness on their part, and they followed this path and will not retreat. The fate of peoples cannot be determined and tampered with in such a way. Despite this, you ask me what could the solution be? The solution exists. What is this solution? If we were to return to our senses then we would return to what should have happened with Hafiz Al-Asad 2 days before my trip [to Israel]. This is a tactical matter. The Arabs say: We do not approve of what you did with Israel because we have no faith in it or in what it says. They kept on saying this even after I got back 80--back 80 percent of Sinai, and I will be getting the remainder next year, God willing. They know that what they say is baseless. But no. If we were to return to our senses, they would say: We do not approve of what you did with Israel, but what is sensible in the peace process is that it will settle the Palestinian question, which is the second part of the Camp David agreement. Regarding the Camp David agreement, has Egypt assumed an Arab responsibility without consulting the others? No. Egypt has undertaken to settle the Palestinian question. Egypt has undertaken such a responsibility before. I can protest and say: Egypt made a fateful decision earlier. Egypt decided on the October war amidst your jubilations, and none of you could have made such a decision in the past or make it now or in the future.

In Baghdad you decided that Egypt was not one of you. Thus, the military solution was ruled out in Baghdad during the peak of nervousness and a decision on a peaceful solution was made. Well, since you know all this, why didn't you come and say: We do not approve of what you did, oh As-Sadat, but we will watch the peace process that will end the occupation. Instead of being permanent, let up put limits to this occupation and let us see if this will work or not. This is the correct approach to the comprehensive solution. Did I ever say anything else? Never. This is the only logical thing. What remains is how would this matter end? The issue wouldn't be settled if I were to do now what they did in Baghdad, when the said: Begin must give us the land. Begin laughed at them then and said: I will give you nothing when you sit in Baghdad and tell me to come and hand over. I will hand you nothing. Anyone who has land with me, let him come and sit with me and talk. You have a problem with me and your land is with me, so why not come and talk with me?

This is the logic of the entire world. They laugh and resort to their slogans. Every time statements are made in Israel, they counter them with shouts and nervous behavior. Well, folks, in a period of 10 months between my visit to Jerusalem and the Camp David meetings, Begin and I exchanged the most violent attacks, but we believed in peace. We were thus able to sit together after 10 months and establish peace in a way that was beyond the imagination of everyone.

Question: Can Your Excellency tell the object of the statements that are being made by states like Saudi Arabia, admitting that Egypt is great, that it is responsible and that it is the basis, but then adding something about Camp David? You answered the question about the Camp David accord saying: Let them read it and then we will discuss it. What is the object when they say now and then that there will be a reconcillation and rapproachement with Egypt?

Answer: This is definitely the guilt complex, as I said 3 years ago when terrible changes were taking place around us in the region. Afghanistan was occupied and a revolution took place in Iran that shook the entire Gulf. The Soviet Union began interfering and saying: I have a leg in the Gulf. It issued an appeal. Brezhnev appeared on the scene later and said: Come and let us talk about the Gulf. He made a second appeal recently, saying: Come and let us talk about the Gulf.

Well, what business does he have in this? There is also the progress of the Lebanese war and what happened to the Arab peoples. There is the more than 3-year-old civil war in Syria, which he [Hafiz al-Asad] is trying to obliterate with his operation in Lebanon. Furthermore, there is what has taken place in every Arab country around us in the Arab east and Arab Maghreb. Well, all this has happened and they were all shaken inside their countries by internal operations or by the Iranian revolution. Saddam's attack on Iran and what is happening between Iraq and Iran has shaken all of them except one country. Well, why? Nobody thinks why. We ourselves speak with the logic of reason and therefore the changes that are taking place around us only increase our firmness. Isn't this a pointer to you that a feeling of guilt is behind what is daily being declared, in Saudi Arabia at one time and by circles in Iraq at others, that we must work with Egypt. It is known that Iraq came to Egypt and Egypt was up to the level of its Arab responsibility.

For sure, 3 or 3 and 1/2 years later they found out that Egypt was right because what Egypt had done has today been turned into established, firm facts in the region. Everything else is finished. Iraq used to export 3.5 million barrels of oil every month and was, consequently, one of the richest countries in the world. Today, Syria and the civil war in Lebanon are taking from them--by order--about $1 billion annually.

We are not malicious, despite all that they have done and despite the fact that we could have been malicious in a way similar to their own standards--but we are not malicious. We are ready to just forget. So, brother, let us act sensibly and do away with emotionalism, hatred, fear and complexes; let us not try to impose our will on each other. What differences do we have, oh Arabs? Am I talking on behalf of the Palestinians? No way! Take the Camp David agreements and read them. I would like to underline this point with three lines, namely, in Camp David, the restoration of the Golan Heights to Syria would have been easier than the restoration of the Sinai. Carter--may God bestow his grace on him--is my witness to this. Why? Because it was his idea and he would have wished from the bottom of his heart to see this plan carried through. Alright, no one in Syria and the Arab world has the courage to deal with the Golan the way I dealt with the Sinai. I would like to hear [other] opinions in this respect. Why? Because I am relating a self-evident fact and no one seems to understand. [words indistinct]

As for the autonomy, we find that they do not support my initiative with Israel. You have the privilege to disagree with our exchange of ambassadors with Israel. It is your right to disagree. But, brother, had this measure been rejected by my people, I wouldn't have gone through with it. Had it not been a measure supported by 99.9 percent I wouldn't have implemented it. Had this measure been supported by only 80 percent and opposed by 20 percent I would have said no; I would hesitate to implement it. But 99.9 percent? The people consider this a self-evident fact.

Question: Some are accusing Egypt of having neglected and shelved the Palestinian autonomy, a fact which renders the Egyptian-Israeli agreement a separate one. What are the facts?

Answer: As I said, had we let reason govern our actions we would have been better off. For instance, you are asking me a question--without getting emotional or malicious--and there is no need to tell me that Egypt has neglected or shelved...but they have the right to say this and I have the right to tell them: Come, let's talk. What is the situation like today? Let's go back a bit to the day when I carried out my peace initiative which resulted in Camp David. Camp David had two parts: The first related to the Egyptian-Israeli treaty and Egypt's relations with Israel and the second related to the Palestinian autonomy.

We could not have paved the way for the forthcoming phase without the first part. Why? I am speaking with logic, oh people, and I am using contemporary terms without riddles, ambiguities or maneuvers. I am saying that a problem of such dimensions cannot be solved in one try, one step or one agreement. Hence, we made the Camp David agreement into a mere framework and indicated this on the agreement, namely, a framework and not a final agreement. That's where they went wrong: They did not read the Camp David agreements--that's number one. Number two: They considered the agreement a final solution. No, oh people, a final solution can only come to a problem of this magnitude by stages. The first stage was between Egypt and Israel. Wasn't it necessary to sit together, get acquainted with each other, talk with each other and express our differences? That's what happened. Why? Because that's what I am going to make of Al-'Arish, with the will of God. Al-'Arish is going to be the place that everyone will come to. The one who replaces Hafiz al-Asad will come to Al-'Arish; the Palestinians will come to Al-'Arish; one day even Husayn will come to Al-'Arish; Lebanon is ready to come to Al-'Arish so that they can sit together with Israel and get it over with. What is Al-'Arish? It is the capital of Arab Sinai. There is no need to be ashamed. Don't we need to lay the groundwork beforehand so that we can base our work on it?

One day Hafiz al-Asad told me: We will not sit together with Israel. Alright, who will solve your problem for you then, oh Hafiz? He said: Brother, during Eisenhower's days in 1956, and during 'Abd an-Nasir's days, the Americans gave the order to Israel to withdraw [from the Sinai]. I told him: You don't seem to read history, oh Hafiz. In '56 three countries were involved. The order was not only given to Israel but to England and France--who disobeyed Eisenhower in his capacity as the leader of the West and committed their act. Eisenhower had an imperialist secretary of state, Dulles, who wanted to get away with the biggest slice, and those three disobeyed him. How come? So the orders were directed to all three and not to Israel alone. However, in '67, oh Hafiz, we were the ones who were defeated by Israel--America, England and France were not involved, as we had noted. So, oh brother, whom shall I call to solve my problem? This is his distorted logic. He does not comprehend self-evident truths. I say, brother, this is a problem that concerns your territory. Whom do you want to solve it for you? Aren't you the one who should take care of this problem? I am saying the same to the Palestinians: Please, come and take over and try to solve your problem, and we will help you--don't leave it to others to do this for you. Take charge of your issue--establish a temporary government, do anything--and we will be behind you with our full support. This is Camp David; it is the first step toward an overall solution. Our part in it is not embodied by a separate agreement. I said as much in the Knesset, namely: This is not a separate agreement and this is not a separate peace. This is an overall solution whose first part is related to Egypt and the second to the Palestinians.

After attaining the Egyptian-Israeli agreement, we said it would take 12 months at the most to reach an agreement on the second part. Yes, the second part was supposed to be concluded in 12 months' time. So, someone can now come and say: I told you so. But this is not the first time; it happened with regard to the treaty between us and the Israelis. Thus, we indicated in Camp David that the last date for concluding the agreement would be after 3 months. We specified the 16th or 17th of December because in September we had determined that 3 months would be the maximum period for concluding the agreement. However, this did not come to pass. Alright, at the time I could have turned the tables and said: This is it, we're through. Israel has violated the Camp David agreement and this is it. But no, we returned 3 months later and concluded the agreement. The same thing happened to the autonomy talks.

But I am not willing to turn the tables because the year has come to an end. The problem is not a small one. This is a great problem. If it was not completed in 1 year, what was important then was continuity, as had happened before, regarding the deadline for the treaty. Four months had elapsed and it was possible for me to turn the table upside down.

If I had done what they did, I would not have accomplished this after 3 or 4 months. Eighty percent of Sinai was restored in 9 months. If I heeded what had been said after my visit to Jerusalem and before Camp David, I would have called off the peace process. No, this is a big battle and the sentiments are grave. We must be patient. Moreover, there was the U.S. presidential election in November. It was obvious and is well known that in an election year in the United States no decisions are made. The electoral campaign begins 7 months before the elections. This meant that no action would be taken from March to November in the United States. This actually happened. What we did not expect was that the regime would change. All the speculation was that Carter would stay in office.

A new President was elected and we had to wait. This was a sound action because without the United States no solution was possible. The United States is the only one which can deal with Israel and solve matters. Israel will not heed others, even the UN Security Council, the whole world and Western Europe. Only the United States could act. We had to wait after President Reagan was elected. He was entitled to take his time to know the problem. I will not see him before next August. He has fixed the month of August for me to see him and September to see the Israeli prime minister, after the elections in Israel. He fixed November to see King Husayn. He will also see others from Saudi Arabia. He is entitled to that.

During the U.S. presidential election, events took place in Israel and consequently the elections were slated for June instead of November. Therefore, we had to wait for the new government. We did not abandon or lose the question. I related these circumstances in sequence for background, so it may be possible to raise this for discussion even on the final date. However, I leave this to those who have the right to say this. I am entitled to reply and say that if what is said is reasonable we will adopt it. But one must not revolve in circles of illogicalness and surrealism and say I would not shoulder the responsibility or give it up.

Well, 80 percent of Sinai has been restored and the remaining 20 percent will be restored in April 1982. The relations process continues. We agreed with one another and opened the borders and so forth. It was apparent that we could coexist in peace. Peace is one million times better than war. What I am saying is the minimum extent of understanding. We have not abandoned the autonomy, but these were its circumstances and implications, although 1 or 2 years in the lives of peoples represent nothing. However, the work continues and all the conditions are available and are not fabricated. If we defer any thing it does not mean that we do not want a solution. But, as I outlined, there were the U.S. elections and then the Israeli elections.

Question: Does this mean that your visit to the United States will be the beginning of a new phase of activity?

Answer: Certainly. During my visit with Reagan we will discuss the current phase and my visualization of the coming phase. He will do the same thing with the Israeli prime minister. Later, as we did before, we will contact one another, the three of us. We will then form our opinion and contact one another again and declare what the future step will be after the three of us approved it. I say that I am still optimistic because I am optimistic by nature. I say, God permitting, that there is a definite chance that we will sign the autonomy agreement before or around the end of this year.

Question: Mr President, there is a lot of talk about the opposition and how it must play its role.

Answer: When I raised this subject, those who are disguised as opposition in order to settle accounts or because of certain grudges believed that I would abolish the parties and so forth. It was really ridiculous because they thought that I would abolish or suspend the parties when I spoke on 14 May. It was ridiculous for them to even think of this.

When I talk about the oppostion, my aim is to say that it is a shame for those who are disguised as opposition--and opposition is a big name--to resort to grudges, settling of accounts, casting doubts and creating incitements. We revolted against such things 29 years ago. Among the 20 opposition members [in the People's Assembly], there are 2 members who took part in the 23 July 1952 revolution and who joined hands with us in revolting against such things.

I say that the opposition is a fundamental branch of the government. A court has three members who set the proceedings of a session--the judge, the prosecutor and the attorney. If any one of them is absent, the session is not valid. The People's Assembly sessions are not valid in the absence of the ministers, even if the ministers are not People's Assembly members. In other words, a minister may or may not be a People's Assembly member. Even if not all the ministers are People's Assembly members, if the People's Assembly convenes in the absence of the ministers the session will not be valid.

A democratic system must have a majority party and an opposition. Moreover, it was myself who called for a multiparty system, and the people approved this. We abolished the one-party system. Let us avoid what corrupted political life before 23 July 1952--which was the behavior of the parties--and see why we revolted against these parties. Not only us, but all the people condemned these parties.

Regrettably, the opposition resorted to the same method that was used prior to the 23 July 1952 revolution. It resorted to the same concept of settling accounts. Some persons who have complexes or who believe they have custodianship over this country and can rule it joined the opposition in order to be protected by democracy. No, opposition should not use democracy to protect itself.

The opposition is not for 1 or 2 years. The opposition must remain forever. The opposition must remain the opposition if we want to build our country and make it prosperous like Western Europe, Canada and the United States, which have their own systems. The Soviet Union has another system. We tried the Soviet system, but it did not work.

We belong to the Third World. However, I sincerely say that we are ahead of the Third World in many great things, such as our political maturity. We have been politically mature for a long time. If in the past we were governed by rulers who were subservient to the king and the British, these rulers did not represent Egypt. Kilearn and Crower humiliated the king, the parties, the ministers and the pashas. We, the youth of Egypt, expelled Cromer.

Amin 'Uthman was expelled from Egypt because those subervient rulers did not represent Egypt. We, the youth of Egypt, represented Egypt. It is like the story of Ireland's battle with Britain--free Ireland, not northern Ireland. Devalera was famous for his struggle.

None of those [old politicians] should claim that they were ruling. The proof is that it was a handful of students who expelled him.

I again say that the government and the opposition are like a court whose session is only valid in the presence of a lawyer, a judge and a prosecutor.

Democracy cannot be practiced without a majority and the opposition should strive to bring about prosperity. You heard me one day saying that the peak of political maturity is to build prosperity. I am not quoting this out of books. No, I am citing the example of countries that want to build themselves--such as West Europe, Canada and America. It is for this that we find that the electoral campaigns in those countries focused on taxes and the standard of living. Take the U.S. elections campaign: Reagan beat Carter on the issue of taxes, the unemployed and the U.S. economy. Building prosperity indicates political maturity. As for the opposition in our country, they say no. It is not for us to deal with eggs and chickens; we will not be dragged into such matters. It is the ruling party that has to deal with eggs and chickens. No, we want to deal with politics. Politics [to the opposition] refer to oldtime concepts [and slogans] such as "Down with British imperialism" and "down with this" and "long live that." These were the oldtime concepts of politics. But today, political activity means building prosperity, building maturity and stability, building a prosperous society, ensuring everybody's daily existence and opening horizons by means of ensuring full rights and a constitution that never cease to exist, even for one moment--which is what has been happening here since 1971.

Why do I blame the opposition? Because the opposition must have a platform and our opposition does not even have a program. On the contrary, some of them have asserted in their newspaper that creating instigations and sowing doubts is permissible. This is ludicrous. What does it all mean? It means that we will create instigations and sow doubts among ourselves. These things used to be said a long time ago when you were working against the British, the king and all the others. At that time there was an enemy. But who is the enemy today? Poverty, disease and backwardness is what we have to fight. Some things about the opposition are evidenced by the fact that there are no differences over some national matters. But these concepts are nonexistant [among our opposition] because it gives the right to create instigations and sow doubts. Alright, the day Begin attacked Schmidt, the latter refused to retort; the German opposition retorted. The same opposition that opposes Schmidt told Begin to draw the line. We must bear in mind that only a few votes separate the ruling party in Germany from the opposition party. However, the opposition stood up [to Begin] because this is Germany and this represents Germany's image abroad. On the other hand, in Egypt the opposition has people whose hobby is sowing doubts, creating instigations and trying to impose themselves on their country by the dint of rights of unknown origin, to say nothing of the hatreds and revenge. Every one [of them] wants to distort Egypt's image or, putting it simply, as our daughter 'Azzah wrote all of these traits regrettably, exist among the opposition. They are unwilling to understand because they are self-righteous. Therefore, I do not want to cooperate with hatred, because, as I told you, the day I start doing this I will either deal a blow to or deviate from our people's will. I say I know about 99.9 percent of our people and they know me. Until a sound opposition is established, the National Democratic Party will assume both tasks. But we will not abolish the parties and we will not renege on promises; we will not suspend the constitution and we will not carry out any measures whatsoever. I do not want to waste my time with them.

Question: You will let them stay as they are, sir?

Answer: Yes. This is democratic interaction. Let them just finish themselves off.

Question: Mr President, 2 days ago a book was published in Israel which said that the idea of your visit to Jerusalem and the peace initiative began in 1972. The book said you visited Iran that year and discussed the idea of this initiative with the shah.

Answer: If we return to the events of that time they will provide the answer. I did not visit Iran in 1972, but I visited Iran on 11 October 1971. I was on my way to the Soviet Union to meet with the three Soviet leaders. The shah had invited me to attend Iran's celebrations marking the 2,500 anniversary of the foundation of the Iranian empire. I was preoccupied then with my trip to the Soviet Union. The vice president also attended the celebrations. On my way to Moscow, instead of flying over Turkey, I passed through Tehran and met with the shah. Some may think that it was our first meeting, but it was in fact our third. The first meeting was when we were second lieutenants. He was a second lieutenant in 1938 and a graduate of the war college. Like me, he was born in 1918. He graduated from the war college and was crown prince. He came to Egypt to marry Princess Fawziyah. There was a military parade in Al-Mazah with my battalion, the 4th Infantry Battalion. It was 2 months after I had graduated from the war college. We marched past on that historic occasion. When we met in Tehran airport I told him that there was a friendship between us. I asked which meeting this was and he said that it was the second, as we had met before in Rabat. I told him it was the third meeting and related the story of the military parade in Al-Mazah.

The second meeting was in Rabat in 1969, the year in which the Al-Aqsa Mosque was burned. We met for the Islamic conference called by King Faysal and the king of Morocco in Rabat. Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir was unable to attend because of his illness. We concealed the matter at the time, but Jamal was suffering from acute coronary thrombosis. We concealed this and said he had influenza when in fact it was acute coronary thrombosis, which he suffered in September 1969, 1 year before he died. The conference on the burning of the mosque was held in September 1969.

That meeting with the shah of Iran was a quarrel between us--a real quarrel between me and him. First, I must mention a historical fact. In view of Faysal's stand at the August 1967 meeting in Sudan, 'Abd an-Nasir invited Faysal and he came to Cairo. 'Abd an-Nasir tried to remove all differences because Faysal's stand on Sudan was really excellent.

I was going to attend the Islamic conference so 'Abd an-Nasir told me: Find a way and speak with the shah. Until that time, there had been overt confrontation between him and the shah. They did not like each other. Relations with the shah were broken. 'Abd an-Nasir told me: Find a way. We read that King Husayn was his friend. Try to let King Husayn mediate in this affair. Try to contact King Husayn. I told him I would.

When I arrived in Rabat as head of the Egyptian delegation, King Hassan did his duty as host. However, they were all afraid. When I arrived at night, I was surprised to find out that King Hassan had prepared to host a dinner for me alone. They imagined that I would work to sabotage the conference [words indistinct] United States, imperialism and all this talk. When he hosted a dinner, I expected it to be for the heads of delegations, but found out that it was for me alone. I understood the situation and told King Hassan that Jamal had asked me to talk with King Husayn so that he would mediate between us and the shah. Nobody believed this would happen [words indistinct]. I told King Hassan: I have come to speak to King Husayn about this so that he will arrange a meeting between us.

Indeed, I contacted King Husayn and told him: Jamal has asked me to convey such and such a message to you. Therefore, please try to arrange for us to meet at your residence.

When he went to speak with the shah--I do not know who was responsible for the misunderstanding--when he went to speak with the shah, I do not know what happened. However, afterward King Husayn phoned me at my palace in Rabat and told me: I will come over to your place in 1/2 hour so that you will go to see the shah in his palace. I told him: No, this is not the agreement. I told you that we would meet at your residence. He hung up and the matter ended there. No meeting took place.

How did the quarrel end? Inside the conference, my speech preceded that of the shah. In my speech I said: I want to say that on entering this hall we have left our differences in the cloakroom. We are Muslims and there are no differences among us. The Al-Aqsa Mosque has been burned. All our differences are in that cloakroom. Our differences were left behind in the cloakroom at the Rabat Hilton. This was how I started my address and I continued assuring everyone that we came in a spirit of reconciliation to do something. The shah was the first or the second speaker after me, I do not exactly recall. I found him very reserved while the OAU conference, which convened before our conference, had adopted a very strong resolution. When I saw him like that, I asked to speak. I asked if this was a reasonable thing. I said that we have left our differences behind in the claokroom and asked whether it was reasonable that we as Muslims and kings and presidents of Islamic states should adopt a resolution less than that adopted by the OAU and by the United Nations. I attacked the shah, who was compelled to answer. I then commented and cited a poem in Persian that says he who eats his bread by his sweat is not in need of benevolence from anyone. I said this in Persian. The shah's face was pale and he reacted by applauding. The conferees joined in the applause, for they heard a verse of poetry in good Persian. It is very difficult to speak Persian, which is one of the languages having a weak grammar. This was the second meeting with the shah.

The third meeting, as I said earlier, was during my stopover in Tehran on 11 October. I met with the shah for 2 hours at the airport. I told him that I would be facing the Soviet Union with the same strength that I faced the United States, because the two have put us in a dilemma. He wondered why I was going to the Soviet Union. That year the treaty had been concluded and there was talk about the missiles. However, I frankly told him that I was going to confront the two powers. Regarding Israel, I did not ask him to convey anything to Israel. I was aware of his relations with the Israelis and he was aware of our situation. He asked nothing from me. Therefore, the book may say that there were messages exchanged between me and Golda Meir at the time, but this is absolutely untrue. The indirect contact with Israel started only in November and December 1973, after the battle, and in January 1974 through Kissinger. It was not a direct contact, but an indirect one through which their views were communicated to me and ours to them. We did not exchange any messages. All this took place after the October war, because until the October war I was, as I told the shah, in a dilemma between the two blocs until Kissinger arrived and resolved it. This was precisely what happened.

MAY INTERVIEWS AS-SADAT ON CONTACTS WITH ARABS

NC291235 Cairo MENA in Arabic 0918 GMT 29 Jun 81

[Text] Cairo, 29 Jun (MENA)--President Anwar as-Sadat has revealed the truth about the recent contacts between Egypt and some Arab rulers. In an interview with the Cairo newspaper MAY published today, President as-Sadat says that the main problem in the contacts held with these rulers is that they say reasonable things behind closed doors and completely different things in conferences and in public. The president adds that his recent contacts with the Arab leaders took place last week when the previous Moroccan ambassador to Egypt, 'Abd al-Latif al-Iraqi, was sent to Egypt on an assignment by King Hassan and requested to meet the president, but President as-Sadat refused to see him because his excellency's experiences with King Hassan make him think twice before trying to reestablish contacts with him.

President as-Sadat says: It is very difficult [for me] to believe in or commit myself to any word uttered by King Hassan--particularly since King Hassan announced that it was me who tried to visit him in Rabat after the signing of the Camp David agreement while in fact the opposite is true. It was the king who insisted time and again on this visit.

President as-Sadat says that Morocco's [former] Ambassador 'Abd al-Latif al-'Iraqi was compelled to request a meeting with Dr Mustafa Khalil, Dr Fu'ad Muhyi ad-Din and Kamal Hasan 'Ali and that all of these meetings were futile. The ambassador was carrying a message from King Hassan to the effect that Morocco was prepared to resume its relations with Egypt as soon as Egypt severed its relations with Israel and renounced the Camp David agreement. Dr Fu'ad Muhyi ad-Din told the Moroccan ambassador, verbatim: "I advise you not to say this to President as-Sadat. Come to think of it, I advise you not to say it even to yourself...."

The president also says that another contact took place with Guinea President Ahmad Sekou Toure, who proposed to initiate an attempt to bridge the gaps between Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Morocco. But we told him that, while Egypt has a broad mind and a big heart, it will never implore anybody.

A nonpolitical contact took place with Iraq, but it stopped when Saddam Husayn was deprived of ammunition supplies by the Soviets, who wanted to punish him.

President as-Sadat says: I say to all of these Arabs in the clearest of terms that Camp David has not and will not end and that it has been the only permanent reality for the past 3 years. The president says that Egypt did not sever its relations with the Arabs and did not abandon Arab solidarity--it was the Arabs who did so. The world has come to realize that Egypt without the Arabs can do everything, while the Arabs without Egypt can do nothing.

The president continues: Despite this, Egypt renews its pledges to the Arab and Islamic countries: If any Arab or Islamic country is subjected to an aggression against which it cannot defend itself, Egypt will not hesitate for even 1 minute to make all its facilities available to allow a foreign power to stopover on its way to rescue that Arab or Islamic country. However, there is one holy principle from which we will never deviate: Egypt will never allow foreign presence in its territories.

In his interview with the newspaper MAY, President as-Sadat divulges important secrets, published for the first time, including the fact that the king of Morocco, after first playing host to the shah when he left his country, issued an ultimatum to the shah that he must leave Morocco within 24 hours. He also sent an envoy to Egypt, asking and insisting that it play host to the shah.

President as-Sadat adds that Al-Qadhdhafi, who sheds tears over the spilled Muslim blood and accuses Egypt of arming Iraq to fuel the Iraqi-Iranian war, has himself been proven to have been fueling the Iraqi-Iranian war. The president says that he recently saw a number of aerial photographs of giant jumbo planes with Iranian markings being loaded in Al-Qadhdhafi's airports with arms from Libyan stores. The following is President as-Sadat's interview with the newspaper MAY, giving the truth about Egyptian-Arab contact:

Question: What is the truth about the Egyptian-Arab contacts discussed by a Saudi paper quoted by our press? What change has occurred in the Arab position to make Egypt accept it enthusiastically as a basis for reconciliation with the Arab regimes which broke off relations with Cairo?

Answer: We must acknowledge the fact that those Arabs who isolated themselves from Egypt have harmed themselves, not Egypt. What is really pathetic is that those people opposed the Camp David agreement before its provisions were published.

In other words, they attacked something about which they knew nothing except the name, which means that the attack on Camp David was premeditated regardless of whether or not the agreement fulfills the Arab nation's objectives and aspirations. In my opinion it was premeditated. The simple proof of this, which partly answers your question about Egyptian-Arab contacts, is that when I was in the United States in 1978 for the Camp David talks, King Husayn of Jordan happened to be in London at the time. It also so happened that he stayed at a hotel where an Egyptian official, one of my aides, was staying. The King found this out and went personally to the Egyptian official's room. He asked him: Are you in contact with President as-Sadat? The young Egyptian said he was and the king told him: Please contact As-Sadat at Camp David and assure him on my behalf that Jordan is now ready to join the peace process.

The Egyptian young man was surprised by what King Husayn said to him. He was even more surprised by the fact that the king came to his room in person instead of sending for him. The young Egyptian interpreted this to mean that the king considered this step to be very important and wanted it to be shrouded in complete secrecy.

The Egyptian young man became enthusiastic and hastened to contact me by telephone at Camp David and conveyed to me the king's message. I asked him for King Husayn's telephone number, and then asked to be connected with him. I spoke to Husayn and asked him if he did go to see this person in his hotel room and ask him to inform me of Jordan's readiness to take part in the Camp David talks, and Husayn confirmed everything I asked him about.

At that time all signs indicated that it would be difficult to achieve an agreement with Israel. I had already spent 1 week in the United States and we had achieved nothing. King Husayn asked me what we have achieved in the negotiations, and I told him: Nothing until this moment. The gap between us is very wide. He asked me again whether there was hope of achieving anything. I told him: I cannot tell you now. It is necessary to wait to know what will happen. I will get in contact with you if something is achieved. What is your schedule in Europe? He said to me that he would be leaving London for Madrid within a few days, and then for Rabat to meet with King Hassan. I promised to contact him as soon as there was any sign of progress in the Camp David talks.

Actually, I was studying the matter and trying to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of King Husayn's participation in the negotiations at this time. The process was facing difficulties and all signs indicated that the negotiations would fail. The matter required some patience and strong nerves, and although King Husayn has strong nerves, he certainly has no patience. If he joins the negotiations now, he would certainly increase the difficulties, especially in view of King Husayn's tendency toward outbiddings. This alone would surely lead to the suspension or freezing of the negotiations. I thought about all this before I contacted King Husayn by telephone. I thought that the best thing to do was postpone King Husayn's participation in the negotiations until after something acceptable was achieved in the negotiations. This is what I did. Had I acted according to the old method I would have immediately welcomed Jordan's participation, and we would have embarked on the traditional outbiddings which lead to failure and the issuance of the same sort of threatening statements we all know.

What matters is that King Husayn agreed with me and told me that he would wait a telephone call from me wherever he may be--London, Madrid or Rabat. Then the telephone conversation ended.

Not 1 day had passed before I was surprised to hear Barbara Walters in her political TV program say that she had contacted King Husayn in London, and asked him to come and join in the Camp David negotiations, but that King Husayn had rejected As-Sadat's request and decided to cut short his visit to Europe and return directly to Amman. It was indeed a strange surprise.

I asked that the U.S. television network be informed that what King Husayn told Barbara Walters in Washington a few days later--I asked her: Why didn't you try to contact me to verify the statement King Husayn attributed to me? I then told her the full truth.

The important thing is that what Husayn had done confirmed that the whole episode had been premeditated. He contacts me and offers to join me in the negotiations and then cancels his visit to Spain and Morocco and returns directly to Amman after saying that As-Sadat proposed that he join him in Camp David but that he refused.

Question: Why did King Husayn change his position so quickly, particularly since he was the one who asked to contact you and asked to participate in the Camp David negotiations?

Answer: It was just a matter of outbidding. He first supported the process and then rejected it. He also had contacted me and asked to participate. Then orders were issued from Saudi Arabia for him to return immediately to Amman and to declare his rejection of Camp David and its negotiations. This is exactly what Husayn did.

Now we come to what King Hassan did. I had decided to return from the United States directly to Egypt, without a night stopover in any European country, as I used to do.. However, King Hassan insisted that I visit him in Rabat on my way back to Cairo. King Husayn, the king of Jordan, knew about this and he told me that he would be waiting for me in Rabat with King Hassan on my return from the United States. This is what Husayn told me on the telephone. Then he said that I asked to see him in Rabat to try to convince him to take part in the peace process, but that he refused and was forced to cancel his visit to Morocco. I didn't pay much attention to this contradiction because I was used to it and I knew who moves King Husayn and who he spoke for.

When we reached an agreement in Camp David, the Arabs rose up and announced their rejection of the agreement. They began voicing their rejection, denunciation, condemnation and outbiddings. I asked the Egyptian ambassador, Dr Ashraf Ghurbal, to contact the Moroccan ambassador in Washington and to ask him to convey to King Hassan my apology for not stopping over in Rabat on my way back to Cairo in order not to embarrass him.

On the same day the Moroccan ambassador met with our ambassador and conveyed to him a message from King Hassan insisting that As-Sadat visit him as he had promised. The Moroccan ambassador spoke much about brotherhood, courage and friendliness which can never end and so on. I asked our ambassador to make another contact to persuade King Hassan to accept my apology for the visit because I did not wish to embarrass him before the Arabs, who got emotional and attacked the Camp David accords and attacked me personally as the one responsible for the peace agreement, which they rejected before seeing even one line of its provisions.

The Moroccan ambassador came back with a second message from King Hassan insisting on the need for me to visit Rabat. In view of this insistence I agreed and the visit took place.

The years passed, and then King Hassan did the same thing that King Husayn had done. He announced a few months ago that it was As-Sadat who contacted him from the United States, very much insisting that he agree to receive him in Rabat while on his way back to Cairo.

Question: These were the contacts which took place before Camp David. What were the contacts that took place after Camp David?

Answer: Contacts indeed took place, including, for example, the arrival of the cousin of Al-Qadhdhafi to see me on 25 December 1980. This day is my birthday, and I always spend it in my village, Mit Abu al-Kawm. Al-Qadhdhafi's cousin came to see me there and told me that Al-Qadhdhafi wanted to sign a secret agreement with us and was prepared to return all contacts to normal provided all this took place without the knowledge of the Arabs. I told him: You do not respect any public agreement.

How can you respect a secret agreement? Al-Qadhdhafi's cousin said: Libya approves of the first part of the Camp David accords on Sinai. It restores to Egypt 80 percent of its territory and will restore the rest of the occupied Egyptian territory later on, and this is a gain which no rational person can reject or oppose. However, Libya objects to the second part on the Palestinian autonomy. Al-Qadhdhafi is of the opinion that this matter concerns the Palestinians alone, and it is not the responsibility of Egypt to solve it for them.

I told Al-Qadhdhafi's cousin: This is what I was afraid of. Whoever reads the Camp David accord will see that it does not deal with the Palestinian problem and does not impose a solution on the Palestinians. Egypt did not invalidate the Palestinian will and did not speak on behalf of the Palestinians. First read the articles of the agreement and then criticize it. All that we did at Camp David was to try to end the Israeli occupation in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and set a 5-year transitional period during which the Palestinians can govern themselves. Isn't this better than the continuation of the Israeli occupation?

We have never spoken on behalf of the Palestinians and we have announced this more than once. When I met with Carter and Begin at Camp David, I told them that we did not and will not speak on behalf of the Palestinians because they alone have the right to do so. All that we could do for them was to remove the Israeli military occupation. I said all this to Al-Qadhdhafi's envoy in Mit Abu al-Kawm. It is certain that Al-Qadhdhafi will deny this when he reads it because it is his habit to do so. It is also the habit of King Husayn and King Hassan.

The same cousin of Al-Qadhdhafi met me again in Paris last February; he sat with me for 3 hours. I explained to him that our position on the Libyan interference in Chad was clear and known. Furthermore, I told him: Tomorrow at the press conference which I shall hold before leaving Paris, I shall attack the Libyan interference with extreme clarity, because we say publicly what we say behind closed doors; and this is something which you do not know.

Question: Is it true that Saudi Arabia had a moderate stand at the beginning of the peace process and that its stand has now changed?

Answer: Yes, and this is something that perplexes me. Ever since the beginning our contacts with Saudi Arabia had confirmed their moderate stand. However, those who go to meet with them in Riyadh hear from them views completely different from the other views they say openly: The view of the closed session is different from the view in the open session. The only Saudi person who had a stand which has not changed is King Khalid. That man rejected my first visit to Jerusalem right from the start and he announced this view in complete clarity. Thus, I was never angry with him. A clear stand is the best method for all dealings among states. King Khalid objected to my initiative and consequently rejected the Camp David accord. This has been his stand. That man has never attempted to falsify or maneuver. He has not said one thing only to say the opposite the next day.

In this regard, I remember a stranger incident. After my visit to the city of Jerusalem, a senior Saudi ruler collected a number of princes and took them into the middle of the desert. They all sat to discuss and consult in their search for an answer to one question: What are we going to do with Anwar As-Sadat, who has deviated from Arab unanimity and has gone to Jerusalem? Naturally, the aim of the meeting was for the Saudi rulers to agree on a secret policy with which to reply to me. They did not meet in Riyadh so the news would not leak. However, what is funny was that NEWSWEEK magazine, or perhaps TIME magazine, published that week the details of that "secret" meeting, which was held in a tent in the heart of the desert.

Question: Let us go back to the Egyptian-Arab contacts, and more precisely to the contact with the Iraqi Government.

Answer: As you are aware, a contact did take place with Iraq. It was a nonpolitical contact and has nothing to do with the Egyptian-Arab stand. All that took place was that the Iraqis were in need of a certain type of ammunition. The Sovit Union, as it has always been its custom, had refused to supply it to them. For example, during the war of attrition which 'Abd an-Nasir initiated against Israel, the Soviet Union became very angry because 'Abd an-Nasir did not first obtain their approval for starting the battles. The Soviets wanted to punish him for this by refusing to supply him with ammunition and weapons on which agreement had been reached earlier. Saddam Husayn faced the same situation. He was compelled to look for ammunition from another country, and Egypt was that country. We immediately agreed and I told them: We would have wished to give you the ammunition free but we find ourselves in an economic conditions that prevents us from doing so. That contact with Iraq stopped when the supply of the required ammunition stopped.

Question: Many circles are talking these days about the renewal of contacts between us and Morocco. The newspapers have published a photograph of Vice President Husni Mubarak shaking hands with the Moroccan delegate at the African summit conference in Nairobi. Some have thought that the publication of this photograph was an indication of the seriousness of the contacts between Cairo and Rabat.

Answer: The latest contact that took place with Morocco was last week. The former Moroccan ambassador to Egypt, 'Abd al-Latif al-'Iraqi, came to Cairo and asked to see me. I refused, not because I am against Arab solidarity, but because my experience with King Hassan makes me think one thousand times before reestablishing contact with him. The man who insisted that I visit Rabat and then announced that I was the one who had asked to make this visit--it is difficult for us to believe any word he says or to believe that he will abide by his word.

Moreover, I remember that one day before flying to the United States to sign the peace treaty someone came to tell me that the Moroccan ambassador, Al-'Iraqi, had arrived in Cairo and asked to see me. I was astonished. I was told that King Hassan had recalled his ambassador in Cairo 1 month ago on the pretext of holding consultations with him, and that he arrived suddenly in Cairo the day before carrying a message to me from King Hassan. I agreed to see him. He came to me and said: By God, I brought you a message from your brother King Hassan on two basic matters: First, he kindly asks you to contact the shah of Iran and host him in Egypt because the situation there no longer tolerates his continued presence in Morocco; second, an Arab summit conference is expected to be held in Baghdad after the signing of the peace treaty, and King Hassan has decided to attend the conference to fully clarify the Egyptian position.

I told the ambassador: I shall contact the shah from the United States and suggest to him that he come to Egypt. As for the Arab summit conference in Baghdad, I thank King Hassan--although I ask no one to defend Egypt, because Egypt did not make a mistake and what it is doing is exactly what its people are convinced of, uphold and insist upon. The meeting then ended.

I then left for the United States, and from there I contacted the shah of Iran in Morocco by telephone and told him: Mohammad, what are you doing in Morocco? By God, I think that I will call on you in Rabat on my way back from Camp David and we can return together to Cairo, or perhaps you prefer to wait until I get back first and then you can come to Cairo later. The shah replied: Really, I don't know what to do, Anwar. I have received an urgent order from the Moroccan Government to leave Morocco by next Friday.

What happened to the Shah after that is known. Rockefeller and Kissinger were able to find a refuge for the shah and his family in the Bahama islands. What I am interested in saying here is to clarify King Hassan's erratic position.

The man tried the impossible, to convince the shah to come and live in Morocco after leaving Iran and arriving in Aswan. He sent his ambassador in Cairo to Aswan to speed up the shah's travel to Rabat. It was the same man who sent me his ambassador--after withdrawing him for a complete month on the pretext of wanting to hold consultations with him--to ask me to play host to the shah in Egypt. When I was late in contacting the shah--because it was unreasonable for me to invite him to come to Cairo while I was away at Camp David, and I preferred to wait until my return or at least invite him to return with me on the same plane--King Hassan thought that I was not going to contact the shah. Therefore, he issued his orders to him to leave the country within 24 hours. It was a strange and amazing position.

Therefore, I refused to receive the Moroccan ambassador, 'Abd al-Latif al-'Iraqi, who arrived in Cairo last week with a new message from King Hassan. I refused to receive him for the same reasons I spoke about earlier and because of King Hassan's previous stands with me.

The Moroccan ambassador was compelled to ask for meetings with Dr Mustafa Khalil, Dr Fu'ad Muhyi ad-Din and Kamal Hasan 'Ali. All these meetings were futile because the Moroccan ambassador came with a message from King Hassan saying: "Morocco is prepared to restore relations with Egypt immediately after Egypt announces the severance of its relations with Israel and its rejection of the Camp David treaty. [Mu'ahadah] Dr Fu'ad Muhyi ad-Din expressed Egypt's answer when he told the Moroccan ambassador, verbatim: "I do not know if President as-Sadat will receive you or not. However, I only advise you not to say it even to yourself." What the Moroccan ambassador heard from Muhyi ad-Din he also heard from Mustafa Khalil and Kamal Hasan 'Ali. The man returned to his country to convey to King Hassan what he had heard in Cairo in answer to his rejected message.

Question: We have heard that Al-Qadhdhafi has attacked Egypt because it supplied ammunition to Iraq and accused it of adding fuel to the fire of the war raging between two Islamic countires--Iraq and Iran. What is your opinion?

Answer: Here is a secret I am divulging for the first time: When Saddam Husayn asked Egypt to sell him ammuniton to use in countering the Iranian attacks, I received definite proof of the suspicious role Al-Qadhdhafi was carrying out to aggravate the war between Iraq and Iran. They brought me a collection of pictures taken from the air, showing Iranian planes being loaded with ammunition at Libyan airports to transport to Iran, and then they returned to repeat the operation of loading and transporting ammunition. I have the pictures in my possession and they are very clear. The Iranian flag emblazoned on the fuselage of the jumbo planes is proof of their identity and of the trick to which Al-Qadhdhafi, who now sheds tears on the spilt Arab and Muslim blood, resorted.

Question: The Saudi information minister said a few days ago that Eygpt's departure from the Arab solidarity is what encouraged Israel to strike at the Iraqi nuclear reactor. What is your answer to this?

Answer: Egypt did not break its relations with the Arabs, nor did it abandon the Arab solidarity. It is the Arabs who severed their relations with Egypt and kept away from it. It is the Arabs who are now demanding that Egypt terminate the Camp David agreements as a condition for their return to it. The Camp David accord has not ended and it will not end. I tell the Arabs once again that Camp David is the only permanent reality that has existed for the last 3 years; it is being strengthened daily. The other realities in the region are the changes we see now: We can see what is happening in Lebanon, between Iraq and Iran and inside Syria.

There is the Western Desert problem, the continuous conflicts among the Palestinian organizations, the problems of Southern Yemen and the dangers that threaten the Gulf states. The Arabs can find no reason for all these tragedies other than the Camp David peg. Camp David is innocent of all this. What is responsible for all this is ignorance, hesitation, fear, lack of frankness, ideological difference, political conflicts and the fact that each regime lies in wait for the other regimes.

Question: Following this review of the facts of the Arab-Egyptian contacts, could we add to it Egypt's view of what could happen between it and the Arabs in the future?

Answer: I forgot to say something. President Sekou Toure contacted me and offered to embark on an initiative to reconcile Egypt with Saudi Arabia, Morocco and Jordan. We told him that while Egypt has a broad mind an a big heart, it will never implore anybody.

We open our hearts and minds and we welcome everybody who comes to us, but we will never implore those who broke their relations with us, tried to impose their trusteeship on us and accused us of all things.

Egypt has not isolated itself. It is the Arabs who have isolated themselves. It has become clear to the entire world that Egypt without the Arabs can do everything; that the Arabs without Egypt can do nothing.

I say this, and I add another fact: This fact is that Egypt renews its Arab and Islamic commitment. In other words, if any Arab or Islamic country is subjected to an aggression, Egypt will not hesitate, even for 1 minute, to offer all facilities to the extent of housing any foreign force required to rescue that Arab or Muslim country. Egypt does not permit the presence of one foreign soldier on its soil. This is a clear and sacred principle. But Egypt will not oppose the hosting of a foreign force and offering it all facilities to enable it to reach and rescue the Arab or Islamic country exposed to foreign danger. Egypt has no need for foreign forces to defend it. We have our intrinsic forces to do this. But we are prepared to accept any foreign force that will stop over in our country on its way to rescue any Arab or Muslim country that cannot defend itself.

This is Egypt, which always abides by its commitments.

Question: A last question: Is there anything regarding the Arab summit conference, in which Egypt will participate, in light of the initiative that Sudanese President Ja'far Numayri has announced?

Answer: I know nothing new on this matter. President Numayri has not yet made a move.

BAGHDAD CARRIES ABC INTERVIEW WITH SADDAM HUSAYN

JN302126 Baghdad Domestic Service in Arabic 1900 GMT 30 Jun 81

[Interview by U.S. ABC network correspondent Barbara Walters with President Saddam Husayn on 28 June via satellite--read by announcer]

[Text] Question: Your Excellency the President: In your cabinet statement last week, you said that Iraq had learned great lessons as a result of the Israeli aggression against the nuclear reactor and that you would implement these lessons. Can you possibly tell us what these lessons are?

Answer: First, you know that Israel attacked Baghdad despite the fact that we are not geographically and militarily on the contact line with it. This means that Israel is prepared psychologically to wage a military action against us at any moment. On this basis, we cannot speak much about the military lessons we have learned from this attack. These lessons will remain for us and for the Arabs who want to benefit from them.

As for the other lessons, the most important one was that it became clear to all the Arabs, including the Iraqis, that Israel is not a group of Jewish persons of Palestinian or other origins who are seeking a haven in wake of the Nazi persecution against them. They are a hostile entity which does not hesitate at all in carrying out its aggression the moment it possesses the technical capabilities for launching an aggression against the Arab nation. Then, the aggression Israel has waged against the Arab nation is not in self-defense but premeditated aggression meant to maintain superiority in favor of the aggressor at all times. Thus, the implementation of the aggression is not linked with intentions because intentions have been settled and are present in the minds of the Israeli rulers and in the minds of those who support them. [sentence as heard] As soon as Israel sees that it possesses the technical capabilities for launching an aggression, it does so against any Arab country of the Arab nation, as evidenced by what it did to Iraq despite the fact that Iraq has no army on the contact line with Israel. This is the most important lesson. This is a lesson whose meanings and details will prevail over all our thinking in order to calculate what will take place in the future. We shall act in the sphere of economy and in other spheres.

Question: Your Excellency the President, have you had any contacts with President Reagan since the occurrence of the aggression?

Answer: We have the U.S. charge d'affaires, whom we have informed about our stand and the aggression that took place. We informed him as we did the other heads of the diplomatic representations. That's all.

Question: Do you have any message that you want to convey to the United States, since this is your first meeting with U.S. television? Is there any specific thing that you wish our people to know?

Answer: Yes, I have a message. The most important thing I want to say is that every U.S. citizen must study the raid against Baghdad alone, independently from what he hears about the Arabs and about the Zionist lobby. He must question himself, study the matter scientifically and ask U.S. scientists concerned with nuclear affairs: was this reactor really of the kind which produces nuclear bombs, and would Iraq's economic and technological situation enable it to produce a nuclear bomb from this reactor instead of using it for development purposes, building our country to remove it from the category of the developing countries or the so-called backward countries?

The U.S. citizen then must ask himself: By what right and in accordance with what law can Israel destroy an economic and scientific establishment just because it thinks that some day this establishment might develop Iraq's technical capability? Israel itself possesses atomic bombs, as admitted by many Western nuclear experts. Israel has not signed the agreement on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. Iraq signed the agreement and opened the doors of its laboratories for international inspection. The U.S. citizen must ask why such an operation was carried out by U.S. arms that are superior to those in Arab hands. Then this U.S. citizen must ask: Is it possible to preserve good relations with the Arabs at a time when the U.S. administration is taking a clear stand on the side of Israel in the military and economic fields and extending to Israel economic, financial and scientific support on a long-term basis? How can the United States of America maintain relations guaranteeing its legitimate interests in the region if it is considered by the Arabs to be a long-time accomplice, in one way or another, in the aggression against the Arabs?

Question: I would like to thank you for this first interview with U.S. television. We are aware and appreciative of your many engagements.

Answer: You are welcome.

Question: I would like to ask you first about your speech at the Cabinet meeting when you called on all peace-loving states to help the Arabs obtain the atomic bomb in order to face Israel because it possesses the bomb. Does this mean that Iraq will attempt to manufacture the bomb on its own?

Answer: This was not the basic thing in our speech at the Cabinet meeting. It was only a passing comment on one side of the problem. I did direct my words at the world states in order that they might supply the Arabs with the atomic bomb. To be exact, I said that, regardless of the Arabs' intentions or capabilities, when Israel possesses the bomb, all peace-loving forces should help the Arabs obtain such a weapon for the sake of peace, that is, for the establishment of a balance between Israel, which possesses bombs, and between the Arabs, who have no bombs. That will make Israel hesitate before using the bomb against them.

Question: In order to have this bomb, is Iraq intending to manufacture this bomb on its own or should we expect a certain state to give or donate this bomb to you?

Answer: Iraq has always been clear in its programs. All Iraq's programs, including the part which was hit by the Israeli Air Force, were intended to develop Iraqi technical and scientific capabilities for faster growth. We in the command never considered possessing the bomb, either by manufacturing it or by any other means, for Iraq or for others.

Question: Has this air raid changed your opinion or point of view?

Answer: No. This is our essential opinion. Yet when we feel that there is an impending Israeli threat against the Arab nation, then we will exploit the maximum energy of Iraqi brains and will use all means to defend ourselves.

Question: I am not sure I understand. I would like to ask this so it can be recorded: Was your last nuclear reactor capable of manufacturing an atomic bomb and will any nuclear reactor you may own in the future be capable of that?

Answer: Scientifically speaking, several Western nuclear scientists have lately spoken about this matter, including French scientists and others from the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA], and have repeatedly said that the Iraqi nuclear reactor was intended for peaceful purposes.

Question: Will this direction continue in the future?

Answer: If we reach any contractual commitment with any of the world states, then we will continue in this direction.

Question: And you will not manufacture an atomic bomb?

Answer: Do you believe that there is a state in the world that will supply the Arabs with reactors capable of manufacturing an atomic bomb? The French previously helped Israel to build its nuclear reactor at Dimona. U.S. expertise also helped Israel to manufacture an atomic bomb in one way or another. However, we still believe that there is no party in the world ready to help the Arabs in this regard.

Question: So you do not think that, even though you asked the peace-loving states to supply you with this bomb, that it would happen?

Answer: We have not asked anyone for that and we have not decided to ask anyone for that.

Question: Can you, Mr President, tell us what the exact condition of the reactor is now? Was it completely destroyed as reports say?

Answer: Yes, completely destroyed.

Question: How much time will pass before you can rebuild the reactor? One report has said 5 years.

Answer: [Words indistinct].

Question: Israel says that if you rebuild the reactor, then it will destroy it again.

Answer: Do you think that, after this experience, Israel would be able to destroy such a thing again? Israel has made a grave strategic mistake, for it has taught not only the Iraqis, but all the Arabs as well, that they should immerse themselves in the important strategic links in economy, science and the necessary technical requirements to such an extent that it would be impossible for the atomic bomb to achieve its objective with a direct hit. Thus, Israel will fail to achieve an objective of this kind in the future. This is one of the lessons the Arabs have learned from the Israeli operations against peaceful installations.

Question: Your Excellency the President, when your foreign minister visited the United States, he had the idea that the United States had prior knowledge about this attack.

Answer: If a great power like the United States, with all its intelligence agencies and its close relations with Israel, did not know about the attack, then the matter is very serious and the same applies if it knew about the attack.

Question: Do you believe that it knew?

Answer: There is a big question mark. So far, information and analyses are not in favor of the United States concerning this issue.

Question: The reasons for the suspicion that you are producing the nuclear bomb essentially revolve around the size of the reactor, the kind of fuel, and the possibility of transforming this into nuclear weapons. It has been said that your installations are of the 40-megawatt type, much larger than what research needs and larger than what is required for nuclear energy research. In addition to this, Your Excellency, France urged you to accept a kind of uranium fuel which is not suitable for the production of weapons when you asked for fuel to produce nuclear energy. Had you accepted this fuel there would not have been any suspicions. Can you answer the questions which arise in our minds?

Answer: You are speaking about ideas that were prepared beforehand. Perhaps they contain some amount of science and perhaps they contain a contradiction to science, regardless of what I say. But I go back to the experts. I clearly said that the nuclear science experts in the West, without any exception, all those who have spoken up to now, are speaking about the Iraqi nuclear reactor, the peaceful reactor, including the French scientists, and the IAEA. They did not speak about a reactor which can use its capabilities for military purposes.

Question: The French foreign minister has said that they can help you. They may help you in rebuilding the reactor. They, however, will increase supervision over these installations four or five times.

Answer: Who said so?

Question: Claude Cheysson.

Answer: In any case and regardless of what he said, supervision was conducted according to the international law on supervision. If an international law on supervision is formulated, we shall allow supervision.

Question: Why have you not replied to this action, and are you preparing plans to confront this Israeli action? Libya's Al-Qadhdhafi has called on the Arabs to blow up the Israeli reactor.

Answer: Israel has struck at our economic installations despite the fact that our army is not fighting with it and despite the fact that we are not geographically in contact with it. It has carried out this action. As to what our rights are, they are known. As for the action we shall carry out against Israel, we shall leave it for the future, but Iraqis are a kind that do not forget their enemy. As for how they will act toward them, it is a matter that depends on many factors and we leave it to the future.

Question: What about Colonel al-Qadhdhafi?

Answer: If president al-Qadhdhafi can carry out what he says, we will give our blessing.

Question: The speaker of the Iraqi National Assembly has called for an oil boycott by the Arab oil-producing states against the United States, for an increase in oil prices or for taking direct action against the United States. Do you approve, and what is your opinion?

Answer: In any case, people who are exposed to aggression have the right to express their wrath against the sources of aggression by a minimum of reaction. You appreciate that the aggression against Baghdad shook the conscience of every Iraqi and every Arab. This aggression was carried out by U.S. weapons. Therefore, all reactions, resolution and criticism to express wrath and chagrin are legitimate.

Question: However, you do not really expect a boycott or an increase in prices or the withdrawal of assets from the United States, or do you think that this is a reality?

Answer: We believe that, when all the Arabs, not only one Arab state, realize that the United States is behaving in a biased manner, they should act collectively in order to rectify this bias.

Question: What was your personal reaction when you heard about the Israeli operation?

Answer: We had been expecting this to happen for a long time. We did not expect the operation to take place when it actually did. We expected that Israel would attack Iraq's oil installations or other economic installations, including the nuclear energy installation, with its air force.

Question: How did you feel?

Answer: Israel is the Arabs' enemy. We are in the forefront of those Arabs who endeavor to expose Israel and fight its aggression.

Question: Is Israel your greatest enemy?

Answer: Yes.

Question: One of Iraq's officials said that she could never imagine an Israeli state, even if this state reverts to its 1967 borders. There must be another state for the Jews and the Palestinians and others, but not the State of Israel. An end must be put to the State of Israel. Is this your viewpoint, Mr President?

Answer: I say clearly that the Arabs must not allow themselves to be ruled by Israeli law. At the same time, they should not accept the oppression of any people in the world, including the Palestinian Jews, regardless of the oppression which the Arabs suffered at the hand of the State of Israel, or the so-called State of Israel. We consider this state to be an aggressive entity. As to the future and how this entity will exist or what its capabilities will be, as to how the Arabs and Jews may coexist without aggression, usurpation and oppression, this is left for the people to decide.

Question: Does Iraq accept UN Resolution 242, which admits the right of Israel to exist within secure borders?

Answer: Iraq has rejected this resolution. You must not take up this point to make propaganda for the Zionists. I say that Iraq has rejected this resolution because it does not realize the Arabs' rights, does not protect them from Zionist aggression and does not restore their usurped land to them. This is the basic cause for our rejection of Resolution 242.

Question: Let us go back to talking about the war between Iraq and Iran. Has the time come for the two countries to solve their differences? If the answer is yes, then are there definite methods to accomplish that, particularly since there are negotiating teams working in this direction?

Answer: As for Iraq, it has always wished the war had not broken out. This is not out of fear of the future. You know that all the Western assessments, including those of the U.S. experts on strategic affairs, of Iraq's ability to stand steadfastly in the face of the Iranian Army and the factors of nature have failed. We are not afraid of the future but we love peace. Therefore, whenever an opportunity of recognizing our rights happens, then we will give up war and march toward peace.

Question: Does this seem nearer now?

Answer: It is not important now for me to read the Iranian mind. What is important for me to say is that the moment there is a chance for peace, then we will be happy to fulfill that peace.

Question: I would like to talk about our countries. Iraq severed its relations with the United States after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. The United States has shown a desire to resume these relations. Now we have seen cooperation in the United Nations between the United States and Iraq in drafting a resolution about Israel. Hence, I would like to ask whether you have warmer feelings toward our country and whether you believe in the resumption of the diplomatic relations?

Answer: What cooperation?

Question: Cooperation in drafting the UN resolution to condemn Israel.

Answer: It was not an issue of cooperation but a discussion by each side on the drafting of the resolution.

Question: I would like to ask whether we are closer now to resumption of diplomatic relations between our two countries.

Answer: U.S. officials have expressed a desire to develop relations and to be granted a chance to assure Iraq of their new attitude toward the issues of the Arab nation and Iraq. We granted them a part of this chance by moving diplomatic relations further, through meeting the U.S. charge d'affairs here and treating him as the head of a diplomatic mission. Of course, this is on a reciprocal basis. We started to brief them on our points of view and to listen to theirs through this diplomatic link. This is the only development that has happened. We accepted meetings on the political level, despite the fact that we have no relations. Yet these contacts are taking place publicly and are well known.

Question: Thank you, Mr President. President Reagan recently said that Israel had reason to be anxious at the possibility of Iraq's manufacturing the bomb, in view of Iraq's history and because Iraq had not signed the cease-fire agreement, had not recognized Israel as a state and had not participated in any peace efforts toward this objective.

Answer: Does the problem of Israel's aggression result from the fact that Iraq did not sign the Camp David accords, which have been called a peace treaty, or the cease-fire agreement in 1948? This is not so. Iraq is not the only party which did not sign these agreements. Israel wants the Arabs to remain backward and wants to remain capable of persecuting the Arabs. That's why it launched the aggression against Iraq. That's why in this case Reagan is not being fair nor accurate in his words. He is not accurate with regard to justice.

Question: You, however, have said that Israel is your greatest enemy. Why don't they have the right to be afraid of the possibility of your producing the bomb?

Answer: Why don't we have the right to be afraid because Israel is our greatest enemy? Has Israel not considered us its greatest enemy? This was contained in statements made by officials. Why did Reagan not say that Iraq has the right to be afraid of Israel?

Question: Israel has stated that it would not be the first state to use the bomb in the Middle East. If the Arab nation and Iraq in particular possessed the bomb, do you imagine that you would be the first to use it?

Answer: We say the following: If Israel is sincere, let it allow the IAEA to increase its activities in this sphere, as Iraq and the Arab countries have permitted it to do.

Question: If you really were to have the bomb, would that mean that the Arab countries would be the first to introduce it to the Middle East?

Answer: This talk about if is unfair. We are talking about a party which possesses reactors for peaceful purposes only and which is subjected to the supervision of the IAEA, while we ignore a party which has not signed the nuclear arms nonproliferation agreement, which does not permit IAEA to inspect its reactors and which really possesses--as Western officials have stated, including a French official, let us say a French expert, that it is believed that Israel possesses several nuclear bombs similar to the bomb which fell on Hiroshima.

Question: Your Excellency the President, Israelis will vote this week to elect the new prime minister. Are you interested as to whether Begin or Shim'on Peres becomes prime minister?

Answer: Let me be frank with you. It makes no difference to us who occupies this post. What we want to hear is that one has come to say that continued occupation of Arab territories, usurpation of their rights and attempts to blackmail them and enslave them are no longer possible and that we have to seek another course for relations in a new direction.

Question: How?

Answer: Israeli officials must tell us how, not Iraq. We have stated the Arabs' objectives in a clear manner through the Baghdad summit conference.

Question: As far as you are concerned, Begin and Peres are the same?

Answer: I am not interested in details. I am interested in the fact that a party must come to say that the aggression against the Arabs and the continued usurpation of their rights must end.

Question: Do you think that the United States will keep its friends?

Answer: We think that, if the United States wants its relations with the Arabs to develop and its legitimate rights to be taken into account, it must be just in the struggle between the Arabs and Israel. This is the answer. It is not only the United States that has relations with Israel. Many states have relations with Israel and at the same time have relations with the Arabs. The main thing is to have a just and evenhanded relationship.

Question: Mr President, it seems that the U.S. Congress is against selling AWACS planes to Saudi Arabia. What are your views?

Answer: We always support the view that the Arabs should have the means and capabilities to facilitate their movement to a technically and technologically advanced position and to enable them to effectively defend their security, sovereignty and future and to place these capabilities at the service of their countries and the Arab nation. We have the same viewpoint concerning Saudi Arabia's possession of any means or equipment.

Question: Do you think that the Israeli attack will unite Iraq with any of the Arab states that at present have differences with Iraq? Are you attempting to improve relations with Syria or Libya?

Answer: Regardless of the details, if lessons are learned from this aggression, these lessons will have a profound and positive effect on the Arabs' interests which would outweigh their losses as a result of the aggression on Baghdad in terms of their relations among themselves or in other matters.

Question: Have you found such a thing happening during the past few weeks in the meetings of Arab bodies and in the conference which was held in Baghdad?

Answer: Surely the Arabs reacted to this aggression in a better way than they would have in the past.

Question: Will they take a unified stand or measure?

Answer: We are a part of the Arabs and we cannot say on the Arabs' behalf what they are going to do. We are a part of the Arabs and an active part in the service of the Arab nation.

Question: Has the Israeli attack brought you closer to the Soviet Union, particularly after you had condemned the Soviet Union's intervention in Afghanistan? Do you find yourselves perhaps closer to the Soviet Union, if only for defensive reasons?

Answer: Our relations with the Soviet Union have been for a long time those of friendship. During recent months, the Soviets have expressed a desire to develop these relations and to promote them. We also have expressed ourselves along the same lines. It is natural that international relations be established on the basis of a community of interests or strategies or both.

Question: Who do you consider a closer friend in the long run in the Gulf region, the United States or the Soviet Union?

Answer: We do not deal with the homeland in parts and we do not consider the nation in parts. He who is closest to us must be the one among them who can understand our legitimate rights, our rights to live and to be independent now and in the future.

Question: Mr President, how do you foresee the Middle East's future in 10 years' time?

Answer: I see that the Arab's capabilities will develop further. Their marginal differences will no longer have a strong impact on their unity regarding the main issues. Furthermore, their mental abilities in the fields of politics, economy, technology and science will broaden and will be in much better condition.

Question: And Israel?

Answer: Israel will be at the beginning of its historically critical situation, for many, including the Jews in the world, will realize that it is impossible to continue the aggression against the Arabs and that they must choose a new path.

Question: Do you see the Arabs winning in this crisis?

Answer: Winning does not start with the results, but much before that. Winning starts with the creation of the means that lead to the achievement of the results and objectives.

Question: Will this Israeli attack mark the beginning of something meaningfully different?

Answer: Yes, very much so. This will affect the nation's development and will affect the criminal's assessment of the ability of law and interrogators to disclose his crime and bring him to court.

Question: Thank you very much, Mr President. Mr President, Begin said that he had to strike now because if he struck later and a bomb had been built, the radiation would kill thousands of people and spread over a very wide area. Is that true?

Answer: You in America, particularly those specialized in nuclear affairs, know that Begin's speech is not scientific and that he wants to give his crime a humane cover. It seems, however, that he is not capable of that. During any stage of the reactor's operation, it is known scientifically that when it is created the radiation spreads only for a few meters--within the reactor itself--and, thus, the radiation does not spread beyond the reactor. Therefore, the claim that Begin sped up the strike on the reactor to avoid subjecting Iraqis in Baghdad to the radiation is not true and is not scientific.

Question: Is there any radiation now on the reactor's site?

Answer: Yes, there is radiation and contamination in the reactor's site itself which is under control. Under no circumstances, as you know, can this radiation spread.

Question: How many persons were killed during the Israeli aggression?

Answer: A number of Iraqis and one Frenchman. Just a few persons.

Question: How many Iraqis?

Answer: I do not remember the exact figure now. I think it is either three or four and a number of wounded.

Question: Why do you think Begin struck now?

Answer: Because he is hostile to the Arab nation. It also seems that he wanted to employ this strike for his election campaign. That is why he chose this time. At the same time he took advantage of Iran's war against Iraq so he could execute his strike, technically speaking.

Question: That is all, Mr President, and thank you.

SADDAM HUSAYN INTERVIEWED BY BRAZILIAN TELEVISION

PY012017 Rio de Janeiro O GLOBO in Portuguese 30 Jun 81 p 6

["Exclusive interview" granted by Iraqi President Saddam Husayn to Globo television channel correspondent Ricardo Pereira on 29 June--place not given]

[Excerpt] [Question] Israel has accused Iraq of manufacturing an atomic bomb.

[Answer] If we were really manufacturing an atomic bomb we would have made it public because we, as well as Brazil, and the rest of the world know that Israel is in the process of manufacturing its own atomic bomb. This is the truth and not mere propaganda. No, we are not manufacturing an atomic bomb. Everybody was well aware of the characteristics of our reactor which was bombed by the Israelis. The French specialists had already guaranteed, and various specialists of the world--including U.S. specialists--had certified that the reactor would serve for peaceful purposes.

In addition, we signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in 1969 and are members of the International Atomic Energy Agency and are subject to constant inspections. It is now, after the bombing of our reactor, that the Arab world needs the bomb.

[Question] Do the Arab countries need to manufacture an atomic bomb?

[Answer] After it remained quite clear to the entire world--through the statements made by the Israelis themselves--that Israel is manufacturing an atomic bomb, it became quite evident to all the countries of the world, to all the countries responsible for maintaining peace, that peace in the Middle East requires an Arab bomb today, in addition to the potential capability which the Arabs have. I believe that even foreign powers should supply the Arabs with the necessary means to withstand the Israeli atomic bomb. This is necessary to maintain an equilibrium in the region and prevent the Israelis from using their bomb against the Arabs. It is the right to self-defense and one of the conditions to maintain peace in the Middle East. One can imagine what the future of mankind would be if the United States had an atomic bomb and the Soviet Union did not have one, or vice versa. With the same reasoning, when talking about worldwide responsibility regarding peace in the Middle East, after Israel publicly admitted that it is manufacturing an atomic bomb (Moshe Dayan and others had already admitted it before), I believe that the Arab world also needs to have its own bomb.

[Question] The Israeli Government has already stated that it is not going to allow any Arab country to manufacture an atomic bomb. Iraq intends to continue with its nuclear research program. What will happen if the Israeli planes return?

[Answer] We will continue to build a better Iraq, a happier country for the Iraqis, therefore, we will continue to develop all the scientific aspects, including the nuclear field, in order to increase our potentials.

Yes, the possibility that the Israeli planes may return exists, but there is always a risk and I believe that we Iraqis and the entire Arab world have learned a lesson. We have learned a hard lesson and the Israeli attack against our reactor for peaceful purposes will always be remembered. This attack came from a country which is not in a declared war with us, from a country with which we do not even share a border. But let me tell you something: If the Israeli planes return they will not have the chance to attack important plants, they will not be able to do it again.

[Question] Mr President, what is your opinion on the accusations that Brazil is sending enriched uranium to Iraq and that Iraqi planes coming from Brazil were stopped in Africa?

[Answer] Israel is perfectly aware that our reactor is for peaceful purposes, but its objective is to prevent Iraq from having access to important technology. These are the reasons for its accusations which are also directed against Brazil. Israel knows perfectly well that those accusations are false and that Iraq does not need enriched uranium, but it is only trying to frighten the world. It is a sort of terrorism against a country which is only working in the nuclear field for peaceful purposes.

Israel's objective is to prevent countries such as Brazil from continuing to cooperate with Iraq. You in Brazil know, as well as I do here and the rest of the world knows, that it is all a lie.

Moshe Dayan and Menahem Begin are constantly lying. Begin said that he attacked the plant on a Sunday when the French technicians are off duty, but he knows very well that the free day here is Friday and not Sunday and that they observe our timetables.

Begin also lied when he stated that he bombed the reactor now because if he waited until it was operating the radiation would destroy the city of Baghdad. If the reactor were bombed when in operation the irradiation would only affect the security area which surrounds the reactor. For this a series of security measures have been taken. Begin tried to give his criminal act a humanitarian touch, thinking that nobody would know the truth.

[Question] Elections are being held in Israel today. Would a change in the Israeli Government bring a change in the Israeli-Arab relations?

[Answer] I have been asked the same question over and over again and have already stated that we do not care who occupies the Israeli leadership. What we are interested in is that there should be a change of mentality. That it should finally be admitted that Israel is making a historical mistake regarding the Arabs by trying to blackmail them, violating their sovereignty and security. They believe that things are going to remain as they are. They have no respect for the Arabs capability and are not capable of assessing the development of international policy.

If we were to appreciate a radical and deep change in Israel some day then we could review our position but the mere replacement of Begin by another person, with the same responsibilities, in no way changes it. Nevertheless, we consider the possibility of someone else taking Begin's place. The change of personalities is important because those acts of aggression are remembered by the name of the leader responsible for them.

Begin's attitude is not personal. They are acts typical of the mentality of persons who live mainly on the usurpation of the land and rights of the Arabs. That sort of mentality still exists.

ARMED FORCES GENERAL COMMAND COMMUNIQUE 385

JN011741 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1652 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Baghdad, 1 Jul (INA)--A military communique issued here today said that during the past 24 hours, Iraqi forces killed 38 Persian enemy soldiers in the operational sectors. Communique No 385 issued by the Armed Forces General Command said that our forces continue to impose their control over the operational sectors. The following is the text of the communique:

In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate. Our triumphant armed forces are retaining their control over the operational sectors. The results of their activities last night and today are:

I. Known enemy losses:

A. One observation post destroyed in front of our positions in the Nowsud region.
B. One ammunition stockpile destroyed in the Sar-e Pol-e Zahab region.
C. One of our advance units attacked enemy positions in the Sumar region with various weapons killing 18 soldiers and destroying 2 infantry positions.
D. Two soldiers killed in the Mimak region in front of our positions in Sayf Sa'd.
E. Three infantry positions destroyed in the Mehran region.
F. Four soldiers killed and one tank and one vehicle destroyed in the Dezful region.
G. Two soldiers killed and two vehicles, one gun and one ammunition stockpile destroyed in the Shush region.
H. A vehicle carrying troops destroyed in the Khafajiyah [Susangerd] region.
I. Our advance forces attacked with various weapons enemy positions and concentrations in the Abadan region, killing 12 soldiers and destroying 1 gun, 1 excavator and 1 ammunition stockpile.

Thus, total known enemy losses are: 38 killed and 5 infantry positions, 1 tank, 4 vehicles, 2 guns, 1 excavator, 3 ammunition stockpiles and 1 observation post destroyed.

II. Our losses:

A. In personnel: Six martyrs in all sectors.
B. In equipment: One tank, one vehicle and one mortar damaged.

[Signed] The Armed Forces General Command, 1 July 1981

KURDISH STATEMENT ON THEFT OF BARZANI'S REMAINS

JN011919 (Clandestine) Voice of Iraqi Kurdistan in Arabic 1615 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Honorable Countrymen: The Political Bureau of our Democratic Party of Kurdistan [DPK] has issued a very important statement. The full text of the statement follows:

A very important statement in the history of the Kurdish liberation movement.

The plots of world imperialism and the reactionary regimes in the region in general headed by the Iraqi fascist regime and its agents in Iranian Kordestan are aimed at striking at the liberation movements in the region, particularly the Kurdish liberation movement, which fights alongside the other Iraqi patriotic forces and parties within the patriotic, democratic and Islamic fronts and alliances that are endeavoring to bring down the regime of Saddam at-Tikriti, which has been waging an unjust war against the revolution of the Iranian peoples for the past 9 months. These imperialist and reactionary forces are continuing their efforts to weaken the Kurdish liberation movement, of which the DPK is the main group, fighting against the falling Saddam Husayn regime of terror. These imperialist and reactionary forces are aware that the groups of the Iraqi nationalist forces are continuing their blows against the forces of the regime all over the country.

In order to relieve themselves of the blows of the Iraqi patriotic and democratic front in general and the blows of the DPK forces in particular, the imperialist and reactionary forces and the fascist Ba'thist regime have perpetrated the filthiest and most sensitive plot for the Kurdish people.

These forces have stolen the remains of the great Kurdish nationalist leader, the late immortal Barzani, from his tomb in Chenu village cemetery in Iranian Kordestan to an unknown place.

Last night, these forces took the blessed remains of the immortal leader Barzani and transferred them to where the enemies of the Kurds and Kurdistan wished them to be. These enemies are represented by the Saddam at-Tikriti regime and its agents in Iranian Kordestan. Let Saddam, his organs of terror and his agents know that this crime of their has not only been committed against the immortal leader and Barzani family but against our party, the Kurdish liberation movement and all liberation movements. Nobody would ever have imagined that the Saddam regime and its agents in Iranian Kordestan would stoop so low as to commit such a crime. Everyone knows who controls Chenu village and who is responsible for the security of Chenu, whose respected people were entrusted with protecting the cemetery. These people are obviously powerless and have no control over the events there.

We ask the beloved sons of Chenu and the Kurdish people in general to give us the right to take revenge on the criminals who committed such a grotesque crime, so that everyone might realize that the Kurdish people are ready to sacrifice their nearest and dearest to defend Barzani's deeds and line of action, and so that justice will take its rightful place and the enemies of our people will be exposed and broken forever.

Despite the Ba'thist regime's plots implemented so far, we preserved our self-control and avoided being drawn inside Iran into side-battles which do not serve the Kurdish people's cause in Iraqi Kurdistan. We believed that the aims behind such battles were meant to distract us from the real march of our struggle. However, their recent crime, which flouts all norms and conventions, has shocked our people and injured their dignity [illegible]thing which can never be forgiven.

A thousand salutes to the chaste soul of the great leader, the immortal Barzani. May shame and ignominy befall the Saddam at-Tikriti regime and its agents in Iranian Kordestan.

[Signed] The DPK Political Bureau in Iraq, 1 July 1981

KURDISH RADIO MOURNS ASSASSINATION OF LEADER

JN011556 (Clandestine) Voice of Iraqi Kurdistan in Bahdinani Kurdish 1600 GMT 30 Jun 81

[Text] Beloved countrymen: We have received with sorrow and regret the news about the martyrdom of the great Kurdish nationalist struggler Salih al-Yusufi at the hands of the repressive tools of the dictatorial Ba'thist regime in Baghdad. On 25 June 1981, two security elements handed him a booby-trapped letter in front of his Baghdad house. The letter exploded and put an end to his life. His chaste boby was buried in the town of Zukhu on 26 June 1981 in accordance with his wishes. The security department had summoned him but he refused to go to them. He was again summoned by the director of the security department himself. At the meeting he refused to eat or drink anything for fear that it might be poisoned, because the regime has killed many adversaries in such manner and was thinking of killing him. We offer condolences to the Kurdish people, to the Iraqi nationalist movement and the relatives of the martyr. We proudly great the chaste soul of Al-Yusufi who devoted his life to the cause of his Kurdish people and to the Iraqi people as a whole, a man who had been a colleague of Barzani's in all the stages of his life.

During the next few days, we will present special programs on the life of this progressive democratic struggler martyr Salim al-Yusufi.

KING INTERVIEWED BY U.S. TELEVISION NETWORKS

JN012211 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 2100 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] His Majesty King Husayn has stated that there is no big difference between the political lines of Begin and Peres, particularly on basic issues. In the debate between him and Begin, Shim'on Peres voiced his fear that Israel might be transformed into a multiracial state.

In an interview with the U.S. television networks ABC, CBS and NBC this evening, his majesty added: I think that there is no big difference of opinion between Begin and Peres on the basic issues, such as the Jerusalem issue and the rights of the Palestinian people in their Palestinian homeland. Begin promised that he would work for the establishment of more settlements and ignored all the agreements signed by Israel. His majesty said: The sad point in the issue is that a large percentage of the Israeli people support Begin's policy and back him in carrying it out.

In reply to a question on the Jordanian role in the process of peace in the Middle East within the peace plan drawn up by the Reagan administration, his majesty said: We made several attempts and have been exerting efforts over many years to voice our opinion honestly and frankly with regard to the points which must be the basis of peace in this part of the world. These points are based on the restoration of Arab territories under occupation since 1967, including the liberation of Jerusalem, the participation of the Palestinians in determining their future and their right to self-determination, their right to establish their state and to have enough guarantees to ensure their security and future.

His Majesty King Husayn added: We have been trying our best for a long time to make those who are interested in a Middle East peace understand the sensitivity and seriousness of this problem and we will exert more efforts. But what can we possibly do after that? This question is directed at the United States. Is the United States able to do something for the establishment of permanent and just peace?

On the Camp David accords, His Majesty King Husayn believes there is no future or any results from the Camp David accords. Begin may return to power in the near future and we know his stand on the issue of the occupied Arab territories; he considers them to be Israeli land. He also considers the Arabs residing on Palestinian soil to be mere strangers and residents who are living on a land Israel claims to be its own.

It is clear that this is not the way that will lead to peace. His Majesty King Husayn said that our spiritual heritage, our past and our present, our aspiration for freedom and our attempt to safeguard our identity, establish relations of friendship with all the peoples in the world, and our attempt to live in peace and security are considerations which are now being exposed to a clear and certain danger.

On the attempt by the new U.S. administration to establish a new form of relations with the Arab countries, as is the case for example in the Gulf, and its role of putting more pressure on Israel, His Majesty King Husayn said: Haig and several U.S. envoys visited the region to become directly acquainted with the problems and to stress United States participation in defending the region. Our reply was that the Arab people had tried to establish friendship and good relations with you, based on mutual respect. The Arab-Israeli issue, however, is the thing which separates the two sides and the Israeli raid against Baghdad has wiped out with a single blow all the justifications that were proposed to the Arab side. The raid has confirmed that the threat Israel poses to the Arab countries is the cause of the dangers and instability in the region.

Further Report

JN020758 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 0600 GMT 2 Jul 81

[Excerpts] His Majesty King Husayn has stated that there is no big difference between the political lines of Begin and Peres, particularly on basic issues.

His Majesty King Husayn added: This state of affairs may drive us all in the Arab world to face the unavoidable reality, namely, our responsibility toward ourselves and our duty to build our power and exploit our resources might give us some influence in this world.

On the repercussions of the Israeli raid on relations with the United States in light of his majesty's recent statements and their impact on Jordanian-U.S. relations, his majesty said: I have always been frank and will continue to be so in my stands and talk. For years, we have been watching what is happening in the occupied Arab land, where we are seeing haughtiness, aggression, real threat and changes throughout the occupied land and in Arab Jerusalem's features. Moreover, we are sensing the suffering of the Arab people there. We hope that the world, particularly the United States, will realize these facts in order to be able to contribute to the establishment of just and lasting peace in the region.

His majesty asserted the Arab nation's determination to safeguard its pan-Arab identity, freedom and destiny and to shoulder its responsibility toward the coming generations by facing challenges no matter how big they are.

On French President Francois Mitterrand's remarks that the Camp David accords are the basis for any peace, his majesty said: We have often asserted and reiterated that the Camp David process is related to Palestine, Jerusalem, the Palestinian people's rights, total occupation, threats and the other occupied Arab territories. It is also related to the denial of the Arabs' rights.

His majesty expressed his conviction that President Mitterrand is aware of the Arab states' sentiments and the Arab people's aspirations. His majesty asserted that an alternative should be found to the Camp David accords if we want to be realistic. However, before this or that, there should be the will and real desire for peace.

Answering a question on whether the United States would move troops to bases in the Gulf region, his majesty said: This has not yet taken place. However, we should keep in mind that the moment a base for any power is established in any region, we can be sure that another base for another power will be established to counter it. Therefore, our real apprehension stems from the fact that the region will become divided and fragmented and that war might flare up in our region. We as Arabs seek to entrench the bases of our freedom, establish the best relations with everybody and build our strength in order to be able to face the problems that surface in this region now and then. If such a thing happens, we ask: Who has the right for direct intervention in the region's security? Is it the Soviet Union or the United States? This can happen and ignite a world war. We believe that we are entitled to regulate our affairs, solve our problems and help one another when the need arises. This method is much better than the introduction of foreign forces into the region. I am definitely against this procedure because it lacks the humanitarian touch.

At this juncture, I would like to stress that the only thing standing between us and the United States is the Palestinian issue, the injustice toward the Palestinians and the constant and unlimited U.S. support for Israel in the political, moral and military spheres. All this is at the expense of the Arab nation. As long as this situation stands, it is extremely hard for us as Arabs to focus on any problem other than that of our rights, security and existence.

BUTRUS ANSWERS QUESTIONS BEFORE DAMASCUS VISIT

NC021033 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 0900 GMT 2 Jul 81

[Text] At 1010 today Foreign and Expatriates Affairs Minister Fu'ad Butrus left Beirut by air for Damascus to discuss with President Hafiz al-Asad and Minister 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam the questions to be dealt with by the Arab followup committee. Before leaving Beirut Minister Butrus made the following statement:

[Begin recording] [Butrus] I believe that it is not difficult for anyone to assume and speculate on the visit and talks. The visit comes within the framework of the followup committee and its work and within the framework of the continuous consultations between the Lebanese and the Syrian Governments to facilitate whatever can possibly concern the two countries, particularly the situation in Lebanon and its efforts to emerge from the present ordeal. The purpose is to coordinate the stands and to hold talks covering all affairs which are currently the subject of discussions within the framework of the followup committee and also outside the framework of this committee.

[Question] Mr Minister, some sides interpret the purpose of your visit to Damascus today as an effort to coordinate the Lebanese-Syrian stands to enter Bayt ad-Din Palace with a unified stand and others believe it is to solve some obstacles between the two sides. How true is this report?

[Butrus] The unification of stands between Lebanon and Syria is a commendable matter and is always desirable. The stands will inevitably converge on a right course which will lead to the desired results over which the two countries and their officials cannot possibly differ. Naturally, the talks will help contribute toward dovetailing the viewpoints and understanding all simple subjects that may arise during the discussions inside or outside the followup committee.

[Question] Mr Minister, how do you evaluate the phase which followed the Jidda meetings and do you consider that any solutions for the Lebanese crisis are near?

[Butrus] It is difficult for a person to make predictions regarding thorny questions with many ramifications as is the case in the Lebanese crisis. However, I can say that the moves we have recently made, particularly since the foreign ministers conference in Tunis, inspire hope that we will ultimately progress toward the aspired solutions.

[Question] Mr Minister, there are still some pending questions concerning Zahlah. Do you believe that these will be solved today?

[Answer] I am not acquainted with the details of the Zahlah question because I was not in charge of handling the question as a separate issue. However, I am aware that some problems were on the way to being eliminated. [end recording]

SYRIANS REPORTEDLY REFUSE TO WITHDRAW FROM ZAHLAH

NC011759 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1715 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Following the Syrians' refusal to withdraw from Al-Hammar, Al-Jisr, Timthal al-Adhra' and the opposite buildings in Zahlah, observers think that the agreement has been carried out by only one side. The Lebanese forces carried out the part of the agreement pertaining to them in full, while the Syrians have refused to carry out the other part.

CABINET MEETS; SARKIS SATISFIED WITH ZAHLAH PLAN

NC011321 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1215 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Excerpts] The Cabinet held its weekly meeting at 1200 today. At the beginning of the meeting the president of the republic expressed satisfaction over the success of the security plan and the restoration of calm in Zahlah after the 3-month ordeal and suffering. He expressed the hope that all Lebanese areas would enjoy stability and that all Lebanese would agree to the national accord principles. He thanked the Arab states and the Arab followup committee for their efforts in this regard.

Al-Wazzan Comments

NC011816 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Following the Cabinet meeting chaired by President Ilyas Sarkis, Prime Minister al-Wazzan said in reply to a question: It is only natural that minor problems will ensue while implementing a programmed plan with regard to a delicate and thorny problem--such as Zahlah's problem. He added that our intentions are bound to lead us to an overall solution and that everyone agrees that this solution must be completed. He went on to say: I believe the matter is proceeding naturally--as you will eventually see.

Asked if moves similar to those taken in Zahlah will be made prior to 4 July in Beirut and its vicinity, the prime minister replied: Yesterday I told you that we are making efforts with regard to all areas. I promised that we will be starting to move soon with regard to the Ra's an-Nab' area. I hope we will soon have happy news regarding this issue.

Asked about the Lebanese working paper, the prime minister replied: I also said that the Lebanese paper is now in the hands of the Arab followup committee, which will continue to study it at the appropriate time.

COMMUNIST LEADER SEES NO SOLUTION 'IN OFFING'

PM011329 Beirut AS-SAFIR in Arabic 28 Jun 81 p 5

[Unattributed report]

[Excerpts] Lebanese Communist Party Secretary General George Hawi has stated that the National Movement does not expect magical solutions from Jidda or Bayt ad-Din and that the situation does not suggest that any solutions are in the offing.

Hawi was speaking at a ceremony marking the graduation of the "Arnun Fortress Martyrs" Battalion (Katibah) in Jazzin area in the presence of representatives of the Communist Party leadership; Mustafa Ma'ruf Sa'd, National Movement secretary in the south; Al-haj Isma'il, commander of the joint forces in the south; Colonel Saqr, commander of the Arab Deterrent Forces in Jazzin; and a multitude of fighters and representatives of parties and movements in the area.

Hawi began his speech by asserting that the martyrs of the Palestinian revolution and the National Movement "have sealed with their blood in Qal'at ash-Shaqif the historical bond between the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples."

He called for "confrontation of the official Arab weakening which reached its climax following the Camp David agreements and after several Arab regimes embarked on tangential battles, isolated themselves and failed to utilize their capabilities in the battle of steadfastness in the Lebanese arena--the battle of steadfastness of the revolutionaries of Palestine, the Lebanese National Movement and the Syrian Army."

Referring to the Lebanese crisis and the proposals that have been made to resolve it, Hawi said: "All the attempts in past years have failed to find a political solution to the country's crisis. Backed by the Palestinian revolution and Syria, the Lebanese National Movement's initiatives for a political solution met with a further escalation of isolationist activities and efforts to establish a racist denominational statelet over part of Jabal Lubnan and Beirut as the nucleus of a sectarian state which would eventually join up with Sa'd Haddad's midget state in southern Lebanon and devour the national areas and link Lebanon's fate with that of the Zionist entity."

He added: The Lebanese nationalist-Palestinian-Syrian alliance is the basic force for the restoration of Lebanon's unity and southern Lebanon, the assertion of Lebanon's Arab character and the safeguarding of the Lebanese people's right to democratic development. We do not expect magic solutions from Jidda or Bayt ad-Din as long as the link with Israel is maintained by one of the disputing groups in Lebanon--the minority which has sold its national cause and renounced its dignity and independence and which falsely claims to be committed to independence--and as long as the legitimate Lebanese authorities are not carrying out their task of imposing the will of the overwhelming Lebanese majority, which is committed to Lebanon's integrity, Arabism and democratic development, continue to cover up the positions of Israel's agents in the country and attempt to undermine the national stance and the Syrian Arab stance, which supports our struggle. As long as the isolationist conspiracy continues and official collusion mounts, there can be no solutions in the offing.

Hawi said: We again denounce all those who raised their voices against the positive initiative that was made by a progressive revolutionary Arab country--the Libyan Jamahiriyah--which has sent volunteers to serve within the Palestinian revolution forces. Israel's feet desecrate Lebanese territory, not the feet of these honest revolutionaries. Welcome to them and to all other Arab revolutionaries who wish to respond to the call of national duty by joining the ranks of the Palestinian revolution. All Arabs are called upon to provide the means of support and steadfastness for the forces fighting in defense of the south. We shall not accept the pittance that is now being offered by way of social and military aid to the south, the Lebanese National Movement and the Palestinian revolution.

AL-ASAD, KHADDAM RECEIVE ZAHLAH MINISTERS

JN011718 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1615 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] At 1430 today His Excellency President Hafiz al-Asad received Zahlah deputies Joseph Skaf, Joseph Abu Khatir and Ilyas al-Hirawi. The meeting was attended by 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs.

The Zahlah ministers expressed thanks and appreciation for Syria's stand and for His Excellency President Hafiz al-Asad's directives which restored normal life to the city. They also spoke about the feelings of satisfaction that prevail over Zahlah in view of the normal situation that has been restored there. They also stressed the special relations that bind Zahlah and Syria together and the Zahlah citizens desire to consolidate these relations.

His excellency the president thanked them and said that Syria harbors fraternal feelings for all the Lebanese people and is exerting its best to restore normal life to all Lebanon through Lebanese national reconciliation.

'Abd al-Halim Khaddam received the Zahlah ministers at 1100 today. The meeting was attended by Faruq ash-Shar', minister of state for foreign affairs. The discussion dealt with the latest developments in the Lebanese arena.

Zahlah Minister Comments

NC011802 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1630 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Prior to the conclusion of the Lebanese Cabinet's weekly meeting, three ministers from Zahlah went to Damascus where they met with Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad and Foreign Minister 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam. The meeting started at 1415 and ended at 1615. Afterward, Minister abu-Khatir made a statement in which he said:

[Begin recording] This has been a short visit to Damascus during which we met with His Excellency President Hafiz al-Asad and discussed the Lebanese crisis in general and Zahlah and its vicinity in particular. We mentioned the links between Zahlah and its neighboring areas. These are long-time links that we are very interested in maintaining. We also noted that Zahlah's experiences have passed the limit of endurance. We expressed our hope that these black days will not be repeated. We took turns explaining this situation. We expressed our hope that, after today, nothing will happen that will harm Zahlah and the areas near it.

We are, therefore, more than certain that prudence has begun to prevail and that the brother Syrian officials are exerting efforts to prevent any disruption between fraternal Lebanon and them. Thus, we now come back full of hope that the crisis will be terminated in a way that will ensure tranquillity and security to Lebanon in general and to Zahlah in particular. After our long meeting with his excellency the president and our friend, Foreign Minister Mr 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, we are certain that the remnants of the previous bitter experience will be obliterated and that Zahlah's inhabitants can rest fully assured there is willingness to aid them in every possible way and that they can resume their work in full tranquillity. We also hope that everyone will rally around the legal authority in order to support and enhance it, so that it can resume its main role. [end recording]

GDR'S GUENTHER KLEIBER LEAVES DAMASCUS 1 JUL

JN011130 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1115 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] In Damascus Guenther Kleiber, deputy chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, expressed his profound satisfaction with the results of his talks with senior Syrian officials. He affirmed that these talks would effectively contribute to developing and strengthening the relations of friendship and cooperation between the two countries in the interest of the Syrian and German peoples. Kleiber and the accompanying delegation left Damascus this morning following a 4-day visit to the country.

BEGIN EXPECTED TO FORM 'STRONGER' GOVERNMENT

TA011831 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1815 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] A senior Likud source has told correspondent Asher Schwartz that Menahem Begin will be able to form a government that will have 63 or 64 Knesset members, a majority. He said such a government would be stronger and more stable than the previous one.

BEGIN, BURG MEET 1 JUL ON FORMING COALITION

TA011744 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1725 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] We have just been informed that a few minutes ago a meeting between Mr Begin and Mr Burg ended. We will now switch to correspondent Shim'on Schiffer, who is near the prime minister's residence:

[Schiffer] The conversation between the prime minister and the NRP leader, Dr Yosef Burg, lasted less than 30 minutes. At the end of the talk, the two faced the press in front of Menahem Begin's home. The prime minister expressed the hope that next week he will be able to complete work on forming the coalition. He was not prepared to add more details. Begin said: I am now entering the monastry of the taciturn and will remain silent until I have completed the job; then I will approach you and inform you.

Let us now hear what Dr Burg said on replying to reporters' questions:

[Begin recording] [Burg] I would like to say that we began an initial discussion on the government that should be formed. There are grounds to believe that the same steadfast parliamentary relations between the religious group and the prime minister's movement and party will continue. We did not discuss details today; it was a preliminary talk. I say the talk was an initial one, basic. I assume--and I would so advise others--that we not waste too much time because the people want a government, a stable government, and want one quickly.

[Television correspondent Yoram Ronen] Dr Burg, will you agree to have the Tami list included in the government?

[Burg] We have never accepted Ben-Gurion's slogan about forming a government with anyone but MAKI [former communist list] and Herut. We do not disqualify anyone. I personally hope that you do not have too great an objection to this. We have always maintained that when Israel is in trouble, it is necessary to form a national unity government. This morning we heard the Alignment is disinclined toward this, and therefore this is at the moment irrelevant, but we will definitely discuss other issues with the prime minister.

[Schiffer] Then why, sir, do you plan to meet the chairman of the Labor Party, Shim'on Peres?

[Burg] First of all, throughout the years I have maintained contact with everyone, even if he is in the opposition, and Mr Begin could testify to that.

[Schiffer] What are the NRP's demands for joining the new government?

[Burg] We will establish a committee for negotiating details. For the moment, we discussed the matter in principle, the basic issues. [end recording]

[Schiffer] To sum up: The NRP is prepared to join a coalition with the government, with the Likud. Will the NRP agree to the incorporation of Tami, Dr Burg was asked? The NRP will not object to it, he replied.

So one can quite reasonably assume that the job of forming the coalition will be fast, as Menahem Begin has promised. So much from the prime minister's residence.

BEGIN REITERATES SUPPORT FOR HABIB MISSION

TA021122 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1100 GMT 2 Jul 81

[Text] This morning the prime minister said that Israel adheres to its agreement that U.S. envoy Philip Habib should continue with his attempts to settle the crisis with the Syrians in Lebanon. Menahem Begin was speaking with members of the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives who called on him at his office in Jerusalem.

The prime minister earlier conferred with former U.S. Vice President Walter Mondale. Among other things, Menahem Begin told Mondale that he had been aware of the international wave of protest which would rise in the wake of the operation in Iraq and, in his opinion, this was a festival of hypocrisy. The European countries, Menahem Begin said, rushed to condemn Israel because of the operation against Iraq but did not behave likewise when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, a country it has been occupying until this very day.

The prime minister said that he is not especially moved by the condemnation voiced by the European countries because they are based on a very specific moral basis. This is the same Europe that instead of welcoming the Camp David accords, launched its own initiative.

NO MAJOR DIPLOMATIC MOVES SEEN UNTIL SEPTEMBER

TA020832 Jerusalem POST in English 2 Jul 81 p 1

[By diplomatic correspondent David Landau]

[Excerpts] President Ronald Reagan's schedule for Middle East peacemaking allows ample time for Israeli coalition-making, and Premier Menahem Begin will not, therefore, be under foreign policy pressures in the weeks ahead as he goes about the task of trying to set up a government. The U.S. President invited Egypt's President Anwar as-Sadat to meet him in Washington in August, and Israel's prime minister--whoever it might be--to follow in early September.

Until September, therefore, no significant diplomatic movement is expected, according to a high source close to Begin.

This pre-planned hiatus, the source added, will effectively freeze any notion that Britain's Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington might have of reviving the "European initiative" at this time.

Similarly, the summer hiatus will apply to the long-dormant autonomy talks with Egypt and the U.S. "Israel did not break off the talks," the high source recalled yesterday, "and it's not our duty to initiate their resumption." But in practice, he was certain, neither the U.S. nor Egypt would propose resuming the talks before the Reagan-As-Sadat and Reagan-Begin (or, perhaps just possibly, Reagan-Peres) summit meetings.

In practice, however, as far as can be foreseen, the immediate foreign policy issues likely to arise are noncontroversial:

--Begin would act forcefully if the U.S. administration goes ahead with its intention to seek congressional approval for the sale of AWACS spy-planes to Saudi Arabia. Israel is pledged to fight this move in the court of American public opinion, and this Israeli opposition to the proposed sale is a matter of broad national consensus.

--Similarly, the prospect of Italy or France reestablishing nuclear knowhow supply channels to Iraq would be fiercely opposed by Israel under the "transition government" if it seemed imminent. On this too, there is broad bipartisan agreement within the Israeli political community.

One issue that the transition Cabinet will deal with in the days ahead is the prime minister's decision to halt the initialling of the Sinai peacekeeping pact pending revision of one clause.

The pact as drafted by Israeli, Egyptian and American officials provides that the "multinational force and observers" could be removed from the peninsula with the agreement of Israel and Egypt. Begin prefers there be no reference at all to the possible removal of the force.

BEGIN DENIES SYRIA MOVED MISSILES FROM LEBANON

TA012009 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 2000 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Prime Minister Menahem Begin has said there is no truth to reports that Syria has removed missiles from the Al-Biqa' region in Lebanon, as reported by the Christian Phalangist radio. Earlier, an army spokesman said that these reports could not be confirmed.

The leader of the Syrian Ba'th Party has said his country would not remove the missiles from Al-Biqa' because it was its legitimate right to station them there and defend its soldiers. The deputy Ba'th leader [as heard] said this while speaking to reporters in the course of a visit to Prague.

JORDAN SAID WILLING TO ALLOW COMMUNIST ACTIVITY

TA011230 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1200 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Jordan has promised the Soviet Union that it will allow the Jordanian Communist Party to operate openly--though it will keep this promise with certain restrictions. Our correspondent, Pinhas 'Inbari, reports that the Jordanian Communist Party will not be permitted to operate under its own explicit name, but only within the framework of the Jordanian-USSR Friendship Committee. The Jordanian prime minister has already received one of the communist leaders in Jordan, who is a member of the committee. King Husayn wishes to form a new government, and one of the candidates for it is the leftist Sulaymen (al-Hadidi). The new government is to reflect Jordan's rapprochement with the Soviet Union and an attempt at a reconciliation with Syria. However, Crown Prince Hasan is against all these moves, and it is possible that Mudar Badran's government will remain in office, or that no salient leftist will head the next government.

LIBYA

STATEMENT ON UAE LEADER'S 1 JUL VISIT TO TRIPOLI

LD011500 Tripoli Domestic Service in Arabic 1230 GMT 1 Jul 81

["Text" of statement issued in Tripoli on 1 July following visit to Libya by UAE President Shaykh Zayid ibn Sultan Al Nuhayyan]

[Excerpts] At the invitation of his brother, Col Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, commander of the Great 1 September Revolution, UAE head of state Shaykh Zayid ibn Sultan Al Nuhayyan paid a visit to Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah accompanied by an important delegation consisting of Shaykh Rashid al-Mu'alla, member of the Higher Council and ruler of Umm al-Quwain, Presidential Adviser Ahmad as-Suwaydi and Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Rashid 'Abdallah.

During the visit discussions were held on the international situation in general and the situation in the Arab region in particular. The leaders of the two countries affirmed their absolute faith in the unity of the Arab nation and the need to mobilize its capabilities to face the challenges of Zionism and imperialism.

His Highness Shaykh Zayid ibn Sultan Al Nuhayyan expressed his support for and appreciation of the initiative made by the brother commander of the Great 1 September Revolution for unifying the Arab and Islamic nation's capabilities, for rising above bilateral squabbles and for deploying all the capabilities of the Arab and Islamic nations in the service of the common battle against the common enemy.

His Highness Shaykh Zayid appeals to leaders of the Arab and Islamic nations to respond sincerely to the sincere initiative which aims at building an Arab and Islamic power capable of safeguarding the dignity of the Arabs and Muslims and protecting the Islamic sanctities.

Within this context, the two countries' leaders address an Islamic appeal to the brothers in Iraq and Iran to stop the shedding of Islamic blood and to declare a truce on the occasion of the blessed month of Ramadan.

As to the Western Sahara, the two sides stressed the importance of settlement of this problem directly by the two parties involved in the conflict for the realization of self-determination.

The commander of the revolution affirmed his support for the Arab Gulf Cooperation Council. He also praised the role played by Shaykh Zayid within this council, through Arab unity.

The two sides studied the grave effects and losses incurred by the oil-producing countries because of the oil glut in the markets. In this regard, they affirmed the need for drawing up a unified policy of prices and production within the framework of OPEC to be adhered to and respected by all member countries.

During the meetings Shaykh Zayid expressed his appreciation of the initiative by the brother commander in calling for Arab solidarity and the casting aside of marginal squabbles among the brothers for the sake of confronting the plots hatched against our Arab nation.

Shaykh Zayid ibn Sultan Al Nuhayyan left the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah this morning. He was seen off by the brother commander of the revolution.

U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT POSITION ON OAU CONDEMNED

LD011814 Tripoli JANA in English 1445 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Tripoli, 1 Jul (JAMAHIRIYAH NEWS AGENCY)--Dean Fisher, spokesman of the U.S. State Department, has criticised the Organisation of African Unity (O.A.U.), for the latter's condemnation of U.S. relations with the racist South African regime at its recent summit in Nairobi. He also criticised the O.A.U. for its support for Jamahiriyah and the latter's presence in Chad. Fisher, furthermore, criticised the summit's decision to hold the next summit in Libya in 1982.

Mr. Ibrahim al-Beshari, secretary of the Administrative Committee for Revolutionary Information in the Jamahiriyah, has responded to Fisher's criticism of the African countries, with the following statement:

One--the American administration is embroiled in backing fascism and racism throughout the world, particularly the racist South African regime and the Zionist racist regime. The African unanimous condemnation of relations between the U.S.A. and the apartheid regime of South Africa is an historic international condemnation.

Two--Fisher's statement is an interference in the internal affairs of African countries which are independent sovereign states, and members of an international organization, the O.A.U.

Three—The summit decision to hold the next conference in Libya affirms Libya's distinguished and great standing in Africa, whether America liked it or not.

Four--Fisher's arguments on terrorism are invalid because the United States is the major terror machine in the world and her interference in African affairs is a part of its terrorising of the world's peoples.

Five--The United States appoints herself as an international policeman which corrects others' conduct, while the U.S. international code of conduct is confirmed as colonialism and terrorist.

Six--the African support for Libya's efforts toward achieving peace in Chad reflects Africa's awareness and determination to solve her own problems and affirms that the Africans appreciate Libya's sacrifices for Chad. This in itself angered the United States which looks at Chad as an area of U.S. influence.

Seven--The U.S. administration has failed in influencing the African countries to take an anti-Libyan stance, despite all its contacts with African governments and messages sent by Reagan to several African heads of states to this effect.

All these U.S. moves have failed, because the African now recognised the reality of the colonialist, terrorist and racist policy of the U.S.A.

MOROCCO

BOUCETTA INTERVIEWED ON RELATIONS WITH MAURITANIA

LD011820 Rabat MAP in English 1234 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Rabat, 1 Jul (MAP)—Moroccan minister of foreign affairs and cooperation, Mr M'hamed Boucetta, granted an interview to the semi-official daily LE MATIN DU SAHARA in which he mainly said that relations between Morocco and Mauritania must be based on the effective neutrality of Mauritania, a neutrality that must exclude the possibility of allowing that aggressions be launched against Morocco from the Mauritanian territory. He added that for its part, Morocco has no intention of interfering in Mauritanian affairs nor of undermining its sovereignty.

About the Nairobi summit, Mr Boucetta outlined that the presence of King Hassan II of Morocco raised the summit to a level that is unfortunately being lost in African summits. "The sovereign's presence was not only symbolic; it was a militant one," said the foreign minister.

Concerning the Sahara, Mr Boucetta outlined that the essential thing was not the referendum or its modalities but to say that Morocco was ready to cooperate with Africa so that it becomes aware of the Moroccanity of the Saharan provinces. On the other hand, the minister affirmed that among the "26" states that had recognized the so-called SDAR, only 10 countries stick to an intransigent position. The others have utterly changed their position or they are moving towards this change.

MISSILE-EQUIPPED PATROL BOATS BOUGHT FROM SPAIN

NC011432 Paris APF in English 1422 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Rabat, 1 Jul (AFP)--Morocco is buying five warships from Spain, the Moroccan daily LE MATIN DU SAHARA reported today. The purchase includes four missile-equipped patrol boats and a corvette. The first of the patrol boats, the "Major El Khatabi," was christened Tuesday by Prince Moulay Rachid, the second son of King Hassan, at Cadiz. The corvette will be delivered in less than a year and the other craft within a year, about four months apart.

The patrol boats are meant for surface and anti-aircraft fighting. They are diesel-powered, about 200 feet long and capable of a speed of 30 knots. Each has four surface-to-surface missile launchers, and guns of various calibres.

SUDAN

NEW YORK TIMES INTERVIEW OF NUMAYRI CITED

JN011615 Khartoum SUNA in Arabic 1445 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Khartoum, 1 Jul (SUNA)--President Numayri has urged the United States to balance its policy towards the Arabs and Israel, stressing that the Middle East, and the Gulf area in particular, have become the world's focal point.

Speaking in an interview with the New York TIMES, President Numayri said that the United States must work with the Arabs more than it works with Israel. President Numayri wondered about the reasons that take the United States so far away from the Arabs and so close to Israel. President Numayri added that the United States had joined the peace talks between Egypt and Israel in order to accelerate the peace process, yet this has taken too long a time. President Numayri wondered also whether this is a part of an Israeli or U.S. policy. President Numayri added that the Arabs are accusing President as-Sadat when he actually knows nothing about the Israeli attacks against the Arabs.

President Numayri called on the United States to adopt a clear policy on Africa. He said that the United States is supporting the racists in Namibia and South Africa, and said that during his chairmanship of the OAU a few years ago, the United States had promised him to make that year the year of the independence of Namibia but nothing had happened in this regard. President Numayri also praised the U.S. aid for the development of the African states and stressed that this is what Africa needs.

As for weapons supplies, President Numayri said that the Americans are very careful about their weapons, particularly warplanes, while the Soviets distribute weapons without any reservation, an action which has caused problems to the states that get weapons from the Soviets. Furthermore, the president added, some of the developing states are now on the brink of bankruptcy because of their arms purchases from the Soviet Union. In another part of the interview, President Numayri said that Colonel al-Qadhdhafi has a big army in Chad and is now moving from Ndjamena to eastern Chad. He stressed that Al-Qadhdhafi's action in Chad opposes the OAU resolutions.

Asked about the impact of the Chadian situation on Sudan, Numayri said that Al-Qadhdhafi does not like Sudan's progress in the fields of development and organization and, naturally, does not like Egypt's peace efforts. Therefore, he sent spies and terrorists to Sudan.

President Numayri added that Al-Qadhdhafi is trying to contact Sudanese delegates in the Western capitals, particularly in London, but is facing great difficulties. Al-Qadhdhafi is hiring papers to launch campaigns against Sudan and, for this particular reason, has opened offices to mobilize the Sudanese students and delegates against Sudan. President Numayri explained that Al-Qadhdhafi had attempted to expel Sudan from the Arab conferences but failed because the Arabs did not believe his fabrications about Sudan.

President Numayri said that the incident of the Chadian Embassy in Khartoum and Al-Qadhdhafi's recruitment of terrorists and agents to carry out his plots led to the severing of relations between Libya and Sudan. The president added that the Libyan Brotherhood Bureau in Khartoum was not for diplomatic purposes. President Numayri explained that some 17 states had already severed their relations with Libya and that Libya had become incapable of existing in the world community.

Asked whether Sudan will work to expel Libya from the United Nations, President Numayri added that he hoped so.

Asked about the possible measures against Al-Qadhdhafi himself, President Numayri said that unfortunately Al-Qadhdhafi's activities are secretive and that most of the states in which Al-Qadhdhafi's agents are active possess constitutional and democratic institutions. Therefore, agents are not easily tried in such states, contrary to the communist states which resort to the termination of agents.

Asked whether there were any specific examples of the measures that might be taken against Al-Qadhdhafi, such as withholding Soviet aid from Libya, President Numayri said: I am not saying that the Russians encourage terrorism, but they do not stop it. They are backing Al-Qadhdhafi in Chad because he backed them in Afghanistan.

President Numayri said the refugee problem had been seriously exacerbated this year. President Numayri said that the refugee commission had promised to allocate greater sums of money for Sudan in appreciation for its efforts in this regard. President Numayri explained that Sudan prevents the refugees from becoming active against their countries.

ETHIOPIA

DEFENSE MINISTER RECEIVES USSR'S SOKOLOV

EA011948 Addis Ababa Domestic Service in Amharic 1700 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Excerpt] Comrade Brig Gen Tesfaye Gebre Kidan, Provisional Military Administrative Council Standing Committee member, defense minister and Commission for Organizing the Party of the Workers of Ethiopia Executive Committee member, held talks today with Comrade Marshal Sergey Leonidovich Sokolov, Soviet first deputy defense minister, member of the CPSU Central Committee and of the Supreme Soviet Presidium and hero of the USSR, on the friendly relations between the armed forces of the two countries.

ETHIOPIAN-CUBAN COOPERATION COMMISSION MEETS

EA302232 Addis Ababa in English to Neighboring Countries 1530 GMT 30 Jun 81

[Text] The first session of the Ethiopian-Cuban joint commission for economic, scientific and technical cooperation is underway in Addis Ababa. The session is aimed at charting out economic cooperation for next year between the two countries.

The Ethiopian delegation to the session is led by Comrade Tokola Dejene, senior deputy secretary general of the Central Planning Supreme Council, and the Cuban delegation is led by Comrade Hector Rodriguez Llompart, minister for economic collaboration. [as heard]

OFFICIAL SAYS AMNESTY FOR ERITREAN REBELS STANDS

NC011615 Paris AFP in English 1537 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Addis Ababa, 1 Jul (AFP)--A general amnesty declared by the Ethiopian Government for Eritrean rebels and those in exile in neighbouring countries still stands, according to a top Ethiopian official in Eritrea quoted in a news report today.

Dawit Wolde Giorgis, the central government's leading representative in Eritrea, said in the Eritrean provincial capital of Asmara that intellectuals and the Eritrean population in general had a duty to make the amnesty offer known to all, the English-language ETHIOPIAN HERALD newspaper reported.

Major Dawit, who was presenting degrees to 43 graduates at Asmara University, also said the Eritrean student movement had a responsibility to explain the "genuine" nature of the Ethiopian revolution and of serving it. Eritrean guerrillas have been waging a separatist war against the central government in Addis Ababa for nearly 20 years in a bid that reached its peak in 1977-78 but has now virtually died out.

Major Dawit was referring to a major policy declaration announced by the government in May 1976, inviting "progressive groups" in the Eritrean rebel movement to enter into a dialogue with the authorities in Addis Ababa to end the problem in the province.

The government also declared a general amnesty, promising to help in the repatriation and rehabilitation of exiles by providing transport, jobs and opportunities for training and resettlement. More than 150,000 Eritreans, including active guerrillas and exiles living largely in neighbouring Sudan, have taken advantage of the offer so far, according to the government.

SOMALIA

SIAD BARRE ADDRESSES NATION ON INDEPENDENCE DAY

EA011232 Mogadishu Domestic Service in Somali 0445 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Excerpt] Challe Mohammed Siad Barre, Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party [SRSP] secretary general and Somali Democratic Republic (SDR) president, addressed the nation last night on the occasions of: 26 June, the SDR northern region's independence anniversary; 1 July, the independence day of southern regions of the SDR and the merger of the two sections of Somalia to form the SDR; and the fifth anniversary of the formation of the SRSP.

Addressing the nation on the radio, Challe Siad said:

[Begin recording] Congratulations to every Somali on this important day of 1 July. It is a day remembered by all Somalis wherever they are. It is a day that came as a result of a long struggle by the Somalis living at that time. They achieved this independence we are celebrating through hard struggle. The colonialists unleashed all forms of torture, imprisonment and death on the Somalis at that time. The Somalis suffered and struggled while they were thirsty, hungry and struck by natural disasters. The colonialists massacred, oppressed and looted the Somalis who brought about this independence, and molested their wives. Many of them lie buried, for although death confronted them they preferred to die struggling for your independence rather than just to sit back and watch colonialists of all colors or creeds taking liberties with you.

I would add that independence cannot be achieved by appeals or begging nor is it proffered on a silver plate. There is only one way to gain independence--by spilling one's blood. If you want a bumper crop from your farms you must properly water the land, apply the necessary fertilizers and weed properly. Similarly, the only way to gain independence is by spilling blood.

Accordingly, my message to all those who are struggling for independence is that you must be prepared to suffer, die and, above all, witness pillage, massacres and rape being perpetrated against you and yours. You can only gain independence and genuine freedom by resisting such things. [end recording]

BURUNDI

PRESIDENT BAGAZA EXPLAINS DRAFT CONSTITUTION

AB011234 Paris AFP in French 1007 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Nairobi, 1 Jul (AFP)--The draft constitution of Burundi, on which a referendum will be held soon, provides for the election of the president of the republic by direct universal suffrage, Burundi Head of State Mr Jean Baptiste Bagaza said in Bujumbura on Tuesday. At a press conference broadcast over Burundi radio, monitored in Nairobi, Mr Bagaza said that the chairman of the National Unity and Progress Party (UPRONA) (the sole party in Burundi) will be the only candidate for the office of president. If he does not obtain the majority of the vote, elections will be held to choose a new chairman of the party.

The text indicates that the party will direct the country's general policy and guide the action of the state. It has already been approved by the party's Central Committee, which is presided over by Mr Bagaza.

Burundi has already had two constitutions, the radio recalled: one based on the monarchy after independence and copied from that of the former administering power, Belgium, and the other based on a republic, following the overthrow of the monarchy in 1966.

According to the draft constitution, legislative power will be exercised jointly by the National Assembly and the president of the republic. A national security court will also be set up.

EQUATORIAL GUINEA

PRESIDENT'S WARNING TO MILITARY REPORTED

LD011938 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1800 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] In his first public speech after the execution of a soldier and the imposition of a number of prison sentences on an indictment of conspiracy against the state, the president of Equatorial Guinea, Teodoro Obiang, has given a serious warning to members of the military not to meddle in political affairs. Obiang said that the army's mission was to keep quiet and obey, and whoever strays from this, he added, runs the risk of paying dearly for his disloyalty to the fatherland.

ZAIRE

REPORTS, COMMENT ON BELGIUM RELATIONS ISSUE

Mobutu Meeting With Envoy

AB020725 Kinshasa Domestic Service in French 0600 GMT 2 Jul 81

[Text] The MPR founding chairman and president of the republic, Citizen Mobutu Sese Seko, yesterday received Belgian ambassador Jean-Paul van Bellinghen at his Camp Tshatshi residence. After the audience, which lasted more than half an hour, the ambassador told journalists, who bombarded him with questions: I have nothing to say now. It is believed that the discussions centered on the present state of relations between Zaire and Belgium.

Minister's Visit Canceled

LD011720 Brussels in French to Africa 1600 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] The Zairian minister of foreign affairs, Mr Bomboko, will not come to Belgium today as planned. The official Zairian news agency, AZAP, announced this this afternoon.

AZAP said: It appears that Zaire is the injured party in this affair. It is, therefore, up to the Belgian Government to give the appropriate explanations now as it has been duly informed of President Mobutu's discontent.

The Zairian agency added that the Belgian ambassador in Kinshasa was summoned to the presidency of the republic today to supply explanations on the subversion--this is the term used by AZAP--on the subversion which is developing in Belgium with regard to Zaire and which, objectively, the Belgian Government is supporting.

The Executive Council--that is, the government--which wants the situation regarding relations between Zaire and Belgium to be clarified once and for all, will give the Belgian Government a reasonable amount of time to make an unequivocal statement. When this period has run out, diplomatic relations between Zaire and Belgium will be broken. This is the essence of the Zaire press agency communique.

It should be remembered that the problem in question is that of the status of members of the Zairian opposition in Belgium. This is a problem which is not new, which has already surfaced on several occasions, but which violently came back to the fore with the appeal made from Brussels on Monday by the former prime minister of Zaire, Mr Nguza Karl-I-Bond. First of all, yesterday morning, General Mobutu announced that he would not hesitate to break diplomatic relations with Brussels if his foreign minister, Mr Bomboko, who was supposed to come to Belgium, did not receive satisfactory explanations and guarantees that the opponents of the regime would be made silent.

Yesterday evening the Belgian Government published a communique in which it detailed its position in diplomatic terms. We want to maintain good relations with Zaire, the text said, with respect to each other's sovereignty and the principles of noninterference. This afternoon Mr Karl-I-Bond published another communique in Brussels. He states that he sees in the Kinshasa Government's attitude the most eloquent demonstration of the climate of intolerance which reigns in Zaire. If the regime were to guarantee basic public freedoms, says Mr Karl-I-Bond, it would be in my own country that I could defend the ideas which I am defending today.

As for the Zaire committee, it also requests the Belgian Government, in a communique published today, not to give way to what it calls the blackmail of General Mobutu. It asks Brussels to make it known that no derogation will be made to the freedom of expression guaranteed by the Belgian constitution.

AZAP Comment

AB011137 Kinshasa AZAP in French 0815 GMT 1 Jul 81

[AZAP commentary: "Reaffirming Our Independence of the Third Party"]

[Text] Kinshasa, 1 Jul (AZAP)--On Tuesday, while addressing a mass rally in Kinshasa [as received] on the occasion of the 21st anniversary of our country's independence, the founding chairman of the MPR denounced the complicity of the Belgian authorities with Zairian refugees in Brussels and so-called opponents of the legal regime of Zaire. The latter, some of whom have resided in Belgium for years, not content with slanderous propaganda against their country and its leader, have recently pledged to plunge Kinshasa into bloodshed to seize power in Zaire.

Those pronouncements were taken up by the Belgian press, radio and television without bringing about the least official reaction from the authorities in Brussels, a peculiar attitude on the part of Belgium which incessantly proclaims its sincere and loyal cooperation and friendship with Zaire.

There are innumerable cases of such complicity and duplicity in the history of Belgian-Zairian relations: On 11 July 1960, Belgium instigated and backed the secession of a Congolese province, Katanga, while maintaining friendly relations with the central government in Leopoldville. Similarly, in 1967, it encouraged the attempted revolt initiated by Jean Schramme and Bob Denard to separate Kivu from the rest of the country and turn it into a state for Belgian settlers.

President Mobutu's decision to break diplomatic relations between Kinshasa and Brussels if nothing is done to control the Zairian refugees in Belgium is, therefore, not unfounded. It is the logical outcome of a long series of freely-committed vexatious and questionable acts that were liable to undermine the sovereignty of Zaire. It is proper that on the occasion of 30 June, the leader of the revolution reaffirmed one of the principles of our sovereignty: independence in decision-making and in the conduct of national affairs.

To Kinshasa, the tacit but active support that Brussels gives to the stray Zairians who have sought refuge in Belgium is a definite proof of the will of the Belgian authorities to exert a certain amount of pressure on the Executive Council in the conduct of the affairs of state.

Belgium will never forgive us for the haste with which it granted us independence in 1960 or for the Congolization of the all-powerful upper Katanga mining union, known today as the General Quarries and Mines Company. It has sizeable economic interests in our territory where more than 40,000 Belgians work within the framework of cooperation between Brussels and Kinshasa.

Belgian political circles desire to maintain and strengthen cooperation between Belgium and Zaire. Belgium has as much to gain as Zaire, if not more, from this cooperation, a Belgian personality said recently during his visit to Zaire. This goes to say that it is in Brussels' interest to control the residence of Zairian refugees in Belgium so that an end can be put to the campaign of denigration against their country and its leader.

The task is not an easy one, but if accomplished it will allow the people of the two countries to forestall the worst that a sudden breaking off of diplomatic relations would mean.

Belgium must choose between cooperation with respect for the sovereignty of our country and the neo-colonialist adventurism that is being proposed to it by a few dangerous refugee cranks with criminal ambitions who are on its soil.

Zaire will no longer tolerate any duplicity of a cooperation or [words indistinct] hiding a stab in the back.

KARL-I-BOND SAYS MOBUTU ORDERED SHABA SHOOTINGS

AB020928 Paris AFP in French 0847 GMT 2 Jul 81

[Text] Brussels, 2 Jul (AFP)--Mr Nguza Karl-I-Bond, former prime minister of Zaire who lives in exile in Belgium, has accused President Mobutu Sese Seko of having ordered the shooting of whites during the Shaba events in May, 1978. In an interview with the Belgian newspaper MET BELANG VAN LIMBOURG, Mr Karl-I-Bond states that General Mobutu himself gave the order to the army to shoot at whites (...) in order to force the hand of the French, who were expected to save his shaky throne.

According to the former head of government, the Zairian president is nearly as scared today as he was during the Shaba war and will once again order the shooting of whites in order to receive the backing he needs to maintain his regime. Furthermore, Mr Karl-I-Bond, who has announced that he will stand for Zaire's presidential elections in 1984, indicated in his interview that his 30 June appeal is now being distributed secretly in Kinshasa. In coming weeks, he added, he hoped to visit several Western capitals to seek support for his political alternatives for Zaire.

GUINEA-BISSAU

LARGE PHOSPHATE DEPOSITS DISCOVERED IN NORTH

AB012006 Paris AFP in French 1821 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Bissau, 1 Jul (AFP)--Phosphate deposits estimated at 35 million tons have been discovered in the north of Guinea-Bissau, the Bissau newspaper NO PINTCHA announced on Wednesday.

The research was carried out by a team of geologists from Guinea-Bissau and the Geological and Minieral Prospecting Office, a French prospecting enterprise whose financial resources are provided by the French aid and cooperation fund. According to the paper, the deposits, which contain 30 percent of phosphorus 205 and which can be exploited over 25 years, extend to neighboring Senegal.

MALI

EXTERNAL RELATIONS SECRETARY MEETS CPSU DELEGATION

AB011753 Bamako Domestic Service in French 1500 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] The CPSU delegation currently visiting Mali had a working session this morning from 0900 to 1300 local time at People's House. This delegation is led by Comrade Usubaliyev, member of the central committee and first secretary of the Communist Party of Kirgizia.

The Malian delegation was led by Dr Mamadou Dambele, secretary of external relations of the Central Executive Bureau [BEC], and consisted, among others, of Mr Bayi Abdou Mohamed, member of the BEC, Bouba Diallo, member of Parliament and (?Serge) Kabril Sangare of the Political Division of the Foreign Affairs Ministry.

The two delegations exchanged views on the life and experiences of the two parties and on international issues. They also discussed problems concerning bilateral cooperation. An artistic show will be organized this evening in the entertainment hall of the omnisports stadium in honor of the Soviet delegation, which will fly to Timbuktu tomorrow.

SUPREME SOVIET MESSAGE DENOUNCES THREAT OF WAR

AB021023 Bamako Domestic Service in French 1500 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] The speaker of the National Assembly, His Excellency Mr Mady Sangare, this morning received the Soviet ambassador, who delivered to him a message from the Supreme Soviet denouncing the threat of war hanging over the world. During their discussions, the two men reviewed the areas of tension in the world and expressed the wish that all parliaments in the world would resolutely call for talks aimed at halting the escalation of the nuclear arms race.

National Assembly Speaker Mady Sangare assured the Soviet ambassador about our country's policy of defense of peace and human rights. He also praised the Soviet Union for the efforts it has always made to safeguard world peace.

NIGERIA

COMMUNIQUE SIGNED ON BOTSWANA PRESIDENT'S VISIT

AB011607 Lagos Domestic Service in English 1500 GMT 1 Jul 81

[Text] Nigeria and Botswana have agreed to conclude and sign agreements to establish the framework for increased cooperation in economic, technical and cultural fields. The two countries are also to explore possible areas of cooperation in the field of agriculture, with special emphasis on cattle breeding. These were some of the decisions taken at the end of bilateral talks in Lagos between President Shehu Shagari and the president of Botswana, Dr Johnny Masire, who ended his 4-day state visit to the country today.

In a joint communique signed by both leaders, they considered the possibilities of establishing a direct telecommunications link between the two countries. They also examined the case for setting up direct air services between Nigeria and Botswana and directed their officials to study more closely the issues involved in the exercise.

On international economic relations, the two leaders viewed with great concern the continued widening gap between the north and south regions of the world and the deterioration of the terms of trade of developing countries.

President Shehu Shagari and Dr Masire, however, noted with satisfaction the continental efforts within Africa to promote intra-African trade. In this connection, they endorsed the program of action adopted by the OAU economic summit in Lagos last year and urged its speedy implementation. President Johnny Masire left Lagos today for home. He was seen off at the Murtala Muhammad Airport by President Shehu Shagari and other top government officials.

TIMES RESPECTS CHOICE OF TRIPOLI AS NEXT OAU VENUE

AB020958 Lagos International Service in English 0830 GMT 2 Jul 81

[Press review]

[Excerpts] The rejection of Tripoli, the Libyan capital, by Egypt and the Sudan as the next OAU summit venue attracts comments from the DAILY TIMES. The paper notes that although the relations among the three countries cannot be seen as cordial, it points out that the venue for every OAU meeting is decided upon at the ministerial level according to an accepted plan. It therefore feels that both Egypt and Sudan [words indistinct] ought to have driven home their points long before now to prevent the choice of Tripoli. The TIMES remarks that it will be in the interest of African unity for both countries to respect the OAU's decision and not to allow inter-Arab conflict to disrupt the organization's operations in any way.

SENEGAL

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ADOPTS LAW AGAINST CORRUPTION

AB010854 Paris AFP in French 1557 GMT 30 Jun 81

[Text] Dakar, 30 Jun (AFP)--A new law allowing the prosecution of holders of governmental or National Assembly posts who would use their offices to enrich themselves illegally has been adopted by the Senegalese National Assembly. This law creates a new offense called illegal enrichment. According to the law, this offense is committed as soon as it is impossible for someone to give proof of the legal origin of the riches that enables him to lead a way of life or to own an estate not in relation to his rightful income.

The offense, punishable by a prison term of 5 to 10 years and a fine equivalent to the amount of enrichment or political, administrative or financial sanctions, is prosecuted and punished by a new authority called the Court for Repression of Illegal Enrichment, presided over by a magistrate.

MOZAMBIQUE

DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH MALAWI ESTABLISHED

EA011212 Maputo in English to Southern Africa 1800 GMT 30 Jun 81

[Text] Mozambique and Malawi are establishing diplomatic relations at the level of ambassador, as of the first of the month. The move follows a meeting held at the beginning of June between the foreign minister of Mozambique, Joaquim Chissano, and the Malawian minister for OAU and United Nations affairs, Malani Lungu. In a joint communique, the two governments expressed their conviction that the establishment of diplomatic relations will greatly contribute to the development of trade, economic and cultural links. They also pointed out that relations between the two countries will be based on noninterference in the internal affairs of each country and on respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

NAMIBIA

MUDGE NOTES NEED FOR NATIONAL ASSEMBLY AUTONOMY

LD301322 Johannesburg International Service in English 1112 GMT 30 Jun 81

[Text] In Windhoek, the National Assembly of South-West Africa has adjourned until 22 September. A record budget and measures to integrate the territory's present services were approved in the past session, but there are also demands for a more autonomous status for the National Assembly. (Ossie Gibson) spoke to Mr Dirk Mudge:

[Begin recording] [Mudge] We want to be able to rule effectively. I think it is inevitable [words indistinct] necessary that we should be able to control the civil service and that we should be able--that we should be given the status by handing over to the interim government part of the government buildings in South-West Africa and the teachers' college, which is the only one of that nature in this country.

[Question] So it excludes matters such as defense and foreign affairs?

[Answer] We are already controlling the territorial force combined [as heard] in conjunction with the administrator general's office; but of course we want to control our territorial force and the local police, but it goes without saying that we cannot control the South African defense force and the South African police.

[Question] South Africa's recent efforts with the United States and also other Western powers to try and get a constitution that will protect the rights of minorities--is this what you're supporting?

[Answer] We support the protection of minority rights and individual rights. We want a bill of rights in this country and the protection and the continuation of the democratic process. But we believe that all these guarantees will mean nothing if a SWAPO government comes to power. They will simply ignore this, and this is the reason why we, in the first place, insist on one guarantee--namely, that there will be a fair and free election--and I mean a fair and free election--in this country, which will give us an equal opportunity to win the election.

[Question] Can I come back to my first question; can I put it to you bluntly: Has there been a clash of meaning with the administrator general on what should be or should not be transferred to the National Assembly?

[Answer] There is no clash between us and the administrator general. Of course, the administrator general is reluctant to amend [words indistinct], so I can appreciate the fact that he is not prepared to open the discussion. I believe the solution is a discussion, a meeting, between the ministers' council and the representative authority for whites. [end recording]